SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 00528 1424

PUBLIC
S.F.
LIBRARY

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 00528 1424

MAIN LIBRARY

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
SINE LITERIS VITA MORS EST

975.3 B84 $\underline{2}$

106065

FORM 3431 8-52

DATE DUE

JAN 20 1982

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

A HISTORY
OF THE
NATIONAL CAPITAL

FROM ITS FOUNDATION THROUGH THE PERIOD OF THE ADOPTION OF THE ORGANIC ACT

BY

WILHELMUS BOGART BRYAN

VOL. II
1815–1878

S. F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1916

All rights reserved

Copyright, 1916,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped. Published May, 1916.

975.3
B84²
106065

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

PREFATORY NOTE

In addition to the acknowledgments of assistance received from various individuals which I have made in these pages, I wish to express my thanks to Appleton P. C. Griffin and Gaillard Hunt of the library of congress. I am also under obligations to the late Thomas C. Noyes, Charles E. Kern, John B. Larner and the board of directors of the Washington board of trade. My work at the library of congress has been aided by Hugh A. Morrison and John G. Morrison of the reading room, John C. Fitzpatrick of the manuscript division and Marcus Borchardt of the document alcove.

WASHINGTON, April, 1916.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-BUY-710

CONTENTS

VOL. II

CHAPTER I

PAGE

Population and building after the war 1
Federal city surveyor 3
No manufactures 4
Coming of people of means 5
Lafayette Square vicinity 7
City and congress 9
The state of the laws 10
The city's health 11
Provision for trees 13
Unlighted streets 14
Neglected Pennsylvania Avenue 16
Congress and street improvement 17
Sale of public reservations 21
Mall improvement begun 25
To tax United States property 26
Formation of scientific societies 28

CHAPTER II

Italian sculptors at the capitol 32
Congress again in the capitol building 34
Improving the capitol grounds 37
A court-house for the city 38
First government art commission 42
General Lafayette's visit 45
White House and social customs 46
District duels and duelling laws 53

CHAPTER III

PAGE
State of the White House 56
Hotels and hotel business 59
Preliminary to the Peggy O'Neale affair 60
Preference shown for boarding-house life 62
The city a national interest 63
Lack of a water-supply system 65
Increase in number of government clerks 66
Two new department buildings 68
Department hours 74
Able men in clerical positions 77

CHAPTER IV

Erection of city hall 79
First civic procession 80
Personnel of circuit court 82
Branding and the whipping post 83
National scope of penitentiary 85
Relaxing the debt laws 89
District as campaign education centre 92
Condition of the jail 93
Modernizing the criminal law 94
Criminal court created 95

CHAPTER V

The city and street improvements 97
Creation of a funded debt 98
Bridges and turnpikes 99
Steamboat lines 102
Completion of city canal 104
Beginning of Chesapeake and Ohio Canal 107
Struggle for the western trade 108
The three towns go into debt 109
Congress helps in canal building 111
Influence of the railroad 115
The city's first railroad 117
Contest over city terminal 119

CHAPTER VI

PAGE
City crippled by canal expenditures 122
Federal relation not recognized 128
Aid to District internal improvements 130
Local phases of slavery contest 133
Condition of the free colored 136
Sale of free men into slavery 138
Antislavery movement in the district 140
Effect of the Nat Turner insurrection 142
The Snow riot 144
Failure of the militia system 146

CHAPTER VII

Change in district government discussed 150
Alexandria and Georgetown dissatisfied 158
Franchise restrictions in Washington 161
The Jackson influence in local politics 165

CHAPTER VIII

Newspapers as personal organs 168
Jackson and the *Telegraph* newspaper 173
Publishing the debates 176
White House in Adams' time 179
A period of church building 183
Washington's lawns and gardens 193
The city's business centre 195
The founding of Columbian College 199
Public schools become "poor" schools 203
John McLeod's school 204

CHAPTER IX

Jackson men and office-holders 211
The inauguration of Jackson 213
Mr. Adams remains at home 216
Relief for the poor 217
The orphan asylums 219
First Washington society novel 221

PAGE
An antilicense law movement 222
Removals from office 224
Shifting of political newspapers 225
Book-stores of the day 228
First labor conflict 230
The ten-hour day 231
Anne Royal and her newspaper 232
The Native American movement 234
Reporters and congress 235
Jackson's second inauguration 236
Pennsylvania Avenue macadamized 237
A water-supply provided 238
Epidemic of Asiatic cholera 239
Attempt on Jackson's life 241
Burning of treasury building 242
The local fire service 243
The Washington Monument Society 245
New department buildings 246
The Jackson City failure 249
The Van Buren inauguration 251

CHAPTER X

Partisan politics affects District relations 253
A restricted franchise 255
Local bank charters a national issue 257
Indignant citizens favor retrocession 259
Influence of economic causes 262
Effect of canal building 264
The Harrison inauguration 269
Provision for a police force 272
Attractive social life 275
The gang evil of the fire companies 276
Political changes and the newspapers 279
The German element 283
Expansion of the central section 284
Defect of the ward system 286

PAGE
Property franchise qualification 289
Broadening the taxing power 290
The state of the city debt 291

CHAPTER XI

Feeling about increasing the taxes 293
A cobble pavement on Pennsylvania Avenue . . . 294
Gas light company chartered 295
Public regulation undertaken 301
Street lighting inadequate 302
Village conditions 302
Primitive waste disposal methods 304
A sewerless city 304
A water-supply provided 305
The Potomac aqueduct 307
Freedom from epidemics 309
The Potomac flats 309
White House abandoned in summer 310
Cemeteries within the city 312
Public buildings overcrowded 315
Neglected public grounds 316
Congress spends money on streets 318
Federal sharing advocated 320

CHAPTER XII

Improvement of the Mall 323
The second scientific society 325
Government scientific work 327
Trees and statuary 328
Use of public grounds 330
Choosing Smithsonian site 331
Completion of city hall 333
The eyesore of Centre Market 334
Institutions, national and also local 336

PAGE
CONGRESS AND THE DEPENDENT CLASSES 337
THE HOSPITAL ON JUDICIARY SQUARE 339
THE CARE OF TRANSIENT PAUPERS 341
CONGRESS PROVIDES FOR FOUR DEPENDENT CLASSES . . . 342
NEW CITY POORHOUSE 342
BRIDGES BUT NOT ROADS MADE FREE 343
THE DECLINING TOBACCO TRADE 343
A PLANK TURNPIKE 344
FIRST RAILROAD TO THE SOUTH 345
STRUGGLE OVER THE SOUTHERN CONNECTION 349
THE USE OF THE LONG BRIDGE 350
OCCUPATION OF THE STREETS 351
DISTRICT'S RAILWAY NEEDS 352
THE BARRIER OF THE RIVER 354

CHAPTER XIII

RAILWAY RATE REGULATION 358
CONTEST BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE RAILROAD . . . 359
REFUSAL TO PAY CITY TAXES 360
MERGING OF OMNIBUS INTERESTS 361
STREET RAILWAY AT FIRST NOT FAVORED 363
MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP PROPOSED 364
INTRODUCTION OF THE TELEGRAPH 366
POLES ON THE STREETS 367
A SUBURBAN MOVEMENT 368
THE DYING SPORT OF HORSE-RACING 369
THE MOUNT VERNON ASSOCIATION 371
IMPROVING THE SCHOOL SYSTEM 372
SECTARIAN INFLUENCE FEARED 373
EFFORTS TO SECURE A SPECIAL SCHOOL TAX 374
THE GEORGETOWN SCHOOLS 375
WOMEN'S SCHOOL FRANCHISE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY . . 376
SOME PRIVATE SCHOOLS 377
NO PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR THE COLORED 378
CONDITION OF THE FREE COLORED 379
THE *NATIONAL ERA* NEWSPAPER 380
ATTEMPT TO FORM A CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH 381

CHAPTER XIV

PAGE
WASHINGTON AS A SLAVE MARKET 384
THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD 385
ATTACK ON THE *NATIONAL ERA* OFFICE 386
NORTHERN PHILANTHROPY AND COLORED EDUCATION . . . 389
THE CONGREGATIONAL OR ABOLITION CHURCH 390
"UNCLE TOM'S CABIN" PUBLISHED 391
SLAVERY AND THE CHURCHES 393
A NATIONAL DENOMINATIONAL CENTRE 394
THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT 395
TOTAL ABSTINENCE ADOPTED 398
FAILURE OF REGULATION 399
PROHIBITION FAVORED 400
THE HEBREW ELEMENT 402
CITY PROVIDES A POLICE FORCE 403
THE POPE STONE EPISODE 404
PARTISAN INAUGURATION MANAGEMENT 405
NEWSPAPERS AND PUBLIC PRINTING 407
PUBLICATION OF THE DEBATES 411
NEWSPAPER WRITERS AND CONGRESS 413

CHAPTER XV

THE TAYLOR INAUGURATION 416
POLITICAL NEWSPAPERS 417
A LOCAL DAILY PAPER PLANNED 419
POLITICS AND PUBLIC PRINTING 423
MAINTAINING A NEWSPAPER ORGAN 424
THE KNOW-NOTHINGS IN LOCAL POLITICS 425
THE NORTHERN LIBERTIES MARKET RIOT 428
DEFECTS IN POLICE SYSTEM 429
THE EVIL OF GAMBLING 432
YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION 433
CRITICISM OF THE COURTS 435
DEFECTS IN THE LAWS 439
SOME NOTED TRIALS 440
NEWSPAPERS AND PUBLIC PRINTING DIVORCED 443

PAGE
Changes in social conditions 444
State of the city streets 446
Social White House customs 447

CHAPTER XVI

The John Brown raid 451
Revival of militia system 453
Union or disunion 454
Local political activity and congress 456
A new police system 457
Period of suspicion and apprehension 460
Changes in newspapers 462
Reliance on the militia 464
Inauguration under arms 468
In the service of the government 470
The city cut off 472
Defensive means adopted 474
Response of the citizens 475
The city as a military centre 476
The hospital service 479
The military prisons 480
The city and federal fire service 482
Rule of the provost guard 484

CHAPTER XVII

War effect on local business 489
A street railway charter 491
Theatres, baseball and social life 494
Condition of the streets 496
Federal sharing in city expenses 498
The citizens plan for city improvement 499
A. R. Shepherd takes the lead 501
Nuisance of pigs and geese 503
Increase in the debt 505
Large building school policy 507
The market and canal 509

PAGE
The special tax method 510
The race issue 513
District emancipation 514
Politics and the courts 517
The fugitive slave law 519
The coming of the contrabands 521
Colored people and the schools 524
Friction with local government 527

CHAPTER XVIII

The colored and the street cars 529
The colored soldiers 532
War alarms in the city 533
Lincoln's second inauguration 535
The joy at war's ending 536
The grief at Lincoln's death 537
The grand review 539
The city after the war 540
Better railroad facilities needed 543
Struggle for the southern connection 544
District negro suffrage 546
Proposed change in government 550
City improvements the goal 552
The stay-at-home vote 555
Change in race conditions 556
The first colored voters 558
National politics in city elections 561
Bowen the colored people's candidate 563
Capital removal agitation 565

CHAPTER XIX

Government change agitation renewed 569
Influence of negro suffrage 571
Grant's second inauguration 573
Territorial government proposed 574
Financial relations left indefinite 577

PAGE
Women suffragists seek recognition 579
The temperance movement 580
Society at the White House 581
Expansion of the city 587
Lack of pavements and of sewers 591
Opposition to the new territorial government . . . 592
Shepherd the storm centre 595
The comprehensive plan 600
Loan bill approved by the people 604
Qualities of the government 607

CHAPTER XX

Lack of proper estimates of cost 609
Failure of debt limit 612
Shepherd's direct methods 614
Car companies and the use of the streets 615
The burden of taxation 617
Speculative movement in property 619
The District becomes bankrupt 621
Intense local feeling 623
Federal sharing a necessity 625
The temporary commission form 627
Shepherd rejected by the senate 631
The half-and-half plan 634
Franchise and the negro 637
The permanent commission form 641

A HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

VOL. II

A HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

CHAPTER I

GROWTH OF THE CITY AFTER THE WAR

Two years after the destructive visit of the British to the city, its prosperous appearance was noted by a writer in the Rhode Island *American*,[1] based mainly upon the number of buildings he had noted in course of erection between the public offices and the capitol. The principal centre of the city was showing the influence of the growth in the population. A good proportion of the new structures was being used in whole or in part for the retail business of the city. For up to this period most of the shopping had been done in Georgetown and Alexandria, but since the war "the great increase in the number and variety of the stores has rendered it unnecessary to leave the city to procure almost any article of necessity, convenience or even of luxury."[2] The average yearly increase of about 500 in the population during the last decade was maintained, although the influence of the war made the growth uneven, as 39 per cent of it was gained in the last two years of the current decade.[3] As compared with Washington's decennial gain, Georgetown had not come within 50 per cent of it and Alexandria 25 per cent.[1] The rush of building led to an increase in the inspection force. Robert King had held the office of surveyor of the city for a number of years by appointment of the superintendent of the city. But in the fall of 1815 Mr. Latrobe, the architect of the capitol, in connection with Robert King, was designated by the superintendent as surveyor of the city and superintendent of buildings.[2] It is probable this addition to the duties of Latrobe as a federal officer came about through his appointment by the mayor of the city to the office just created by the city council of "surveyor of the city."[3] The purpose of this ordinance was to have a city official charged with the duty of determining the lines of the streets which were opened up and improved by the city. At the same time the federal office of surveyor of the city existed as created by the law of 1809, which was much broader in its scope than the city ordinance. By its provisions the surveyor, who curiously enough was to take the oath of office before the mayor of the city, although not appointed by him and in no way under his authority or direction, was given authority to make subdivision of squares into lots and to determine the building line. After Latrobe left the government service no federal appointment of surveyor was made.[4] The mayor, however, continued to provide a surveyor of the city.[5]

---

[1] Reprinted in *Intelligencer*, Aug. 16, 1816.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 31, 1816.

[3] In 1810 the population of the city was 8208; in 1818, 11,299 and in 1820, 13,322.

In consequence of a decision of the circuit court in 1826, which held that the city surveyor appointed by the corporation is "not the surveyor of the city of Washington" within the meaning of the act of congress of Jan. 12, 1809,[1] the city council enacted an elaborate law providing for such an official and prescribing his duties. Many sections of this ordinance were taken bodily from the federal law of 1809. In addition it was stipulated that the office should be in the city hall.[2] Apparently as another outcome of the court decision, Frederick C. De Kraft, surveyor by appointment of the city authorities, brought in a bill for his services as "United States surveyor of the city of Washington from June 1, 1822, to the period of his appointment as surveyor of said city under an act of the corporation thereof passed Aug. 13, 1828," which congress duly paid. In fact, the federal office or rather appointee was not continued, and a municipal officer bore the title, and this situation was recognized in a law of congress which described De Kraft as "United States surveyor of the city,"[3] and furthermore directed that a map or plat of the city prepared by that official be recorded in the office of the commissioner of public buildings and also in the office of the surveyor of the city as the authoritative official map.[4] De Kraft's successor made use of the same official designation.[5] The growth and prosperity of this period may be attributed largely to one cause. The lack of confidence in the continuance of the city as the national centre, which had sapped the energies of the citizens for the past twelve years or more, due to the uncertain and at times apparently hostile attitude of congress, had vanished. There was now a feeling of assurance that Washington would remain the seat of the national government, and the ground for it was found not alone in the vote to continue the sessions of congress in the city, but in the actual commencement of the work of rebuilding the public edifices.[6] The general character of the population as well as the nature of their pursuits remained unchanged. Business continued to be confined to small shopkeeping. Dry goods and grocery stores headed the list in the enumeration of the places of business as printed in the *Intelligencer*.[1] There were no manufacturing establishments or wholesale stores or those engaged in foreign trade mentioned. Since the movement to establish manufactures in the city had practically ended in failure in 1810, nothing further had been done until the year 1816, when a woollen mill was set up at the Little Falls.[2] A knit goods manufactory was also opened in the old mansion house of Notley Young.[3] But in the course of a few years their operation was abandoned. The essential character of the city, as it is known in modern times, is clearly defined at this period. Then, as in later years, its growth presented an anomaly in the history of American cities, where manufactures and trade were the chief elements in promoting prosperity. Washington was but scantily supplied with either, yet it continued to grow. Even when the pressure of hard times was felt throughout the country, observers of conditions in Washington were surprised to find that improvements continued with undiminished volume,[4] a phenomenon which has become familiar and is now recognized to be mainly due to the flow alike in good and bad years of public money in salaries and public works.[5] Years passed before any general recognition was given to the fact that merely as the capital of the Nation, reflecting the influence of the expansion in public business and governmental machinery, and as the population of the country increased, the material advancement of Washington was assured. As the corps of federal officers was added to throughout the country, as post-offices were established and land offices were opened and the federal revenue increased, the public business at the national centre grew. A larger force of employés was required, and more people found it necessary to come to Washington to attend to their interests before congress or the executive departments. Even at this early period in the history of the country the increase in population and the growing trade from the settlement of the vast tracts of unoccupied land west of the Alleghanies can be traced in the fortunes of its capital city.

---

[1] In 1820 the population of Georgetown was 7360 and that of Alexandria, 8218.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 7, 1815. Also in the issue of Sept. 30 notice signed by Latrobe and King that the surveyor's office is now open in the post-office building.

[3] City Ordinance, Aug. 3, 1815.

[4] Resolution of city council, July 7, 1826, calling attention of the president to the omission on the part of the government, since 1814, to provide "a surveyor of the city of Washington." The appointment of Latrobe and Robert King in 1815 was evidently forgotten when this statement was made.

[5] Joseph Elgar was appointed in 1816 and served until 1821, when he was made commissioner of public buildings. He was succeeded by F. C. De Kraft, who held the office eleven years. William Elliot then served from 1832–1835 and then William P. Elliot from 1836–1845. See list of city officials appended to annual corporation laws.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 19, 1826.

[2] City Ordinance, Aug. 13, 1828.

[3] Stats., 4, 524, May 31, 1832.

[4] A map of the city, drawn by F. C. De Kraft and engraved by Mrs. W. I. Stone, was published in 1828 by John Brannan.

[5] Advertisement signed by William Elliot, *Intelligencer*, Sept. 9, 1834.

[6] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 16, 1816.

---

[1] Aug. 16, 1816.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 20 and 25, 1816.

[3] The same, May 8, 1817.

[4] The same, July 24, 1819.

[5] The passage of the years brought no change in this characteristic of the city. In his annual message (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 8, 1845) the mayor, W. W. Seaton, stated that Washington derives no impetus from an extended commerce or manufactures. "Nearly all her business and trade is internal and limited to her own inhabitants and a small circle of adjacent country." He adds, "It is a matter of surprise that her growth has been so rapid and uniform."

As the disturbed condition of the currency, which reached a crisis a few years after peace was declared in the general suspension of specie payments, improved and the protective tariff of 1816 supplied ample public revenue and encouraged manufacturers, and emigration poured in and the western country was settled, the Nation's capital shared in the general prosperity that prevailed. There was another phase of the situation at this time, which is, however, commonly believed to have developed only in comparatively recent years, and that is, the attractions of the national city as a place of residence to people of means. Only two years after the war closed Mayor Blake, in a message to the city council, gave as one cause of the increase in the population of the city, "the acquisition of many wealthy citizens." [1] Three years later this aspect of the life of the city had made such a strong impression on John Law, who came to the city with his father, Thomas Law, a few years after the site was selected, that he declared the city "is now and will daily become a more desirable residence for those who can retire on their fortunes and enjoy the pleasures of a society which is not surpassed in elegance or taste by any city on the continent." [2] No doubt the mayor had in mind the country seat, designed by George Hadfield, which had just been erected by Commodore David Porter on the brow of the hill overlooking the city near the head of 16th Street.[3] The place came to have the name of

---

[1] Jour. of Com. Coun., Vol. 4, May 19, 1817.

[2] Ceremonies and Oration at Laying the Corner-stone of the City Hall, p. 14. Washington, 1820.

[3] For the 110 acres which extended from what is now Florida Avenue to Columbia Road and east of 16th Street, Commodore Porter paid

Meridian Hill from its proximity to the stone that stood in the line of 16th just north of Florida Avenue marking one of the first meridian lines of the city.

In the spring of the same year John P. Van Ness was building on the Burnes home square at the foot of 17th Street N. W. a residence designed by Latrobe, which was more elaborately finished than any private home in the District.[1] The mantels were of marble carved in Italy. The grounds, enclosed with a brick wall with the entrance flanked by lodges, were handsomely laid out. The humble frame house where Mrs. Van Ness was born and which stood near the fine new residence was left untouched, the two illustrating the past and if not the present exactly, at least the future of Washington. On the next square to the north stood a house typical of the two-story-and-attic city home of the period and fronting directly on 17th Street, where Thomas Carbery was living as early as 1819.[2] From this house he went in June, 1822, to take the oath of office as mayor of the city, and there the following spring his sister, who was believed to be a hopeless invalid, was suddenly restored, as was claimed, to active life through the prayers of Prince Alexander of Hohenlohe, who at that time was creating much excitement in Catholic circles in Germany by the accounts of the miraculous efficacy of his prayers.[3] It was not until some three years after the erection of the Porter and Van Ness houses that a beginning of the residence section fronting on Lafayette Square that became noted as the home of people prominent in public and social life was made. Prior to the year 1819 St. John's Episcopal church was the only building on the square. In that year Commodore Stephen Decatur built a

---

$13,000. Deed, Liber A, L, f. 166. March 18, 1816. Also Ten Mile Square, 1830, p. 286.

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 17, 1816, Sept. 29, 1817 and April 13, 1819. In the Ten Mile Square, 1830, p. 271, it is said the house "is probably not excelled by any private building in the country."

[2] *Intelligencer*, April 13, 1819.

[3] The miracle, as it was termed, gave rise to a good deal of comment in this country. See Examination of Evidence and Report on the Miraculous Restoration of Mrs. Ann Mattingly. J. Whitfield, Charleston, 1830. Also Washington Miracle Refuted. Georgetown, 1824.

residence for his own use at the southwest corner of H Street and Jackson Place from designs furnished by Latrobe. It still stands as first built, the only house on the square of an early date that remains unchanged. It was plain in its lines, spacious and had about it extensive grounds; for the commodore, like his brother officer, Commodore David Porter, chose Washington real estate as an investment for some of the prize money won during the years when the ocean was a general battle ground.[1] While the building of the Decatur house was going on, one less spacious and of the usual local design, — two stories high with a sloping roof pierced by dormer windows, — but still having a roomy comfortableness, was being built by Dr. Thomas Ewell a short distance to the south on Jackson Place and now known as No. 14. For a short time the owner, who had been a practising physician in the District since 1805,[2] and like his brother, Dr. James Ewell, was the author of a popular work on medicine, made his home there.[3] Then he leased it, and for some twenty years it was continuously a cabinet home.[4]

At the time of the Decatur and Ewell purchases what is now Jackson Place had not been opened, and an appropriation of $150 was made by the city council "to open and gravel a carriage way 40 feet wide" from Pennsylvania Avenue to H

---

[1] Upon the death of Commodore Decatur the following year the house, now 28 Jackson Place, was occupied by Baron de Neuville, the minister from France, and then by Baron de Tuyll, the minister from Russia. From 1825 to 1833 it was the home of three successive secretaries of state: Henry Clay in Adams's cabinet and Martin Van Buren and Edward Livingstone in Jackson's cabinet. It then became the home for a couple of years of Sir Charles Vaughn, the British minister. Tayloe's In Memoriam, p. 171.

[2] *Intelligencer* Aug. 16, 1805. Also the same, Dec. 18, 1815, and April 24, 1819.

[3] History of the Medical Society, p. 151.

[4] The occupants for that period were Smith Thompson, secretary of the navy in Monroe's cabinet, and Samuel L. Southard, in the Monroe and Adams cabinets; John M. Berrien, attorney-general, and Levi Woodbury, secretary of the navy and also of the treasury in the Jackson and Van Buren cabinets. The Home of Home Club, by Virginia L. Raymond. In *Home Club Bulletin*, October, 1915.

Street, provided the owner of the square advanced the money, to be reimbursed out of any money to the credit of the first ward after the year 1821.[1] Two years later, after Richard Cutts, the brother-in-law of Mrs. Madison, had erected a residence at the southeast corner of H Street and Madison Place, the latter thoroughfare was opened and gravelled at the same cost as that of Jackson Place, and also paid for from the city funds.[2] What is now Lafayette Square continued to be a commons, an open space, until 1826, when the work of levelling the ground and fencing it was begun.[3]

Some years elapsed before it could be said "the ground now called Lafayette Square has been well graded and planted with trees."[4] By the year 1820 the church and the Decatur, Cutts and Ewell houses were the only buildings fronting on Lafayette Square. A square to the north on the north side of I Street, between 16th and 17th streets, stood the residence of Colonel George Bomford, the head of the ordnance bureau. Here he lived until he removed to Kalorama, of which he became the owner in the settlement of the estate of Mrs. Barlow, whose sister was the wife of Colonel Bomford.[5]

At the same time one of those contrasts, so characteristic of the city, was presented in a near-by brickyard.[6] Shortly after the year 1821 an addition was made to the residences on the square, when Thomas Swann erected a house at the northeast corner of 16th and H streets. In that year he was appointed district attorney, succeeding Walter Jones. Like Mr. Jones he was a resident of Alexandria, but for a portion of the twelve years he held the office he made his home in this city.[7]

In another section Robert Brent, who had employed the designing skill of Latrobe, was erecting on the northern borders of the city, about at the head of 7th Street northeast, Brentwood, a large residence for his own use, which he did not live to occupy, as he died in the year 1819. It became the home of his daughter Eleanor, who married Joseph Pearson, whose term of service as member of the house of representatives from North Carolina ended in 1815. It was probably not entirely due to his personal relations in the city where he finally made his permanent home that during his term in congress Mr. Pearson gave special attention to District affairs. The service he rendered was not overlooked by the city authorities. They also bore in grateful remembrance the good offices of Joseph Kent, a representative from Maryland, whose home was in Bladensburg. When these legislators, both of whom served on the District committee, retired from congress in the spring of 1815, the city council proposed they be invited to attend a dinner it was decided to give to Representative Joseph Lewis of Virginia, chairman of the District committee, and to the mayor and the committee that attended to the interests of the city before congress. It was intended to be "a testimony of respect entertained by this corporation of their uniform exertions and good wishes on behalf of the people of the District."[1] The dinner was not given by the corporation, as a question was raised as to the propriety of such an expenditure of public money, but as an early illustration of that personal touch in the relations between congress and the city, which has been such a powerful influence in District legislation, the incident is of value. The proposed dinner would have brought together the official representatives of the city before congress and members of the house District committee, to which since its creation in 1809 had been referred all matters of District legislation. The year following this incident the senate increased the list of its standing committees by creating one on the District,[2] while an act was passed providing for the preparation of a code of laws for the District, which resulted in the Cranch code.[1] This latter action was not the direct outcome of a reference in President Madison's message to the need of a revision in the criminal code of the District.[2] But it came up in the house after a resolution had been voted down to subscribe to a collection of laws relating to the District, which J. B. Colvin, one of Jefferson's newspaper writers and a clerk in the state department, proposed to publish. Some two years before Colvin had been authorized to collect and publish the laws of the United States, existing then only in pamphlet form for each session, but it was expressly stipulated that those relating to the District be omitted.[3] While this attempt on the part of Mr. Colvin to utilize the excluded material failed,[4] yet it led to a discussion of the state of the District laws and called the attention of the house to a condition which involved absurdities and also hardships, if not injustice and inhumanity, in keeping on the statute books of the District old English laws and colonial laws of Maryland and Virginia, many of which had long since been modified or repealed by those states. Although the Cranch code was not adopted, still the authority given to prepare it bore witness to the humanizing of public sentiment, and no doubt gave further encouragement to the practice of the District judges in refusing to impose the barbarous penalties of laws, obsolete in practice if not in theory. In a way this chain of incidents illustrates the growing importance of District affairs in the national legislature, as well as some of the defects in congressional methods which affected District interests.

---

[1] Ordinance, Oct. 19, 1818.

[2] Ordinance, Oct. 24, 1820. The house, somewhat changed and enlarged, is now the home of the Cosmos Club.

[3] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 284.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 18, 1834.

[5] *City of Washington Gazette*, July 6, 1820. Advertisement of sale of lots by William Simmons.

[6] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 29, 1820.

[7] In 1833 Francis Scott Key succeeded him, serving for eight years, or until the Whig administration. At the beginning of Jackson's first term the Swann house, now 1611 H Street, was leased by Baron Krudener, the Russian minister.

---

[1] Resolution Com. Coun. Proc., Vol. 4, March 2, 1815.

[2] Annals of Congress, December, 1816, p. 36. Armistead T. Mason, whose home was in Loudoun County, Va., was made chairman.

Nearly a quarter of a century had passed since congress began to enact laws for the Nation, and yet no collection had been made of them. In repairing this neglect, congress refused to extend the same advantages to the District. In fact a collection of District laws was not made until some fifteen years later, when W. A. Davis, a printer and bookseller of Washington, brought together and printed all the laws of congress relating to the District up to the year 1831. The practical value of this publication, the result of private enterprise, and, by the way, a capable piece of work, no doubt resulted the following year in beginning the practice on the part of congress of publishing in separate pamphlet form the District laws of each session. At first the District edition did not always include all the laws, but apparently only those regarded as the principal ones.

---

[1] Stats., 3, 323. April 29, 1816. [2] Annals of Congress, Dec. 3, 1816.

[3] *Washington City Weekly Gazette*, Jan. 6, 1816.

[4] Annals of Congress, Dec. 12, 1815, p. 385. When the collection and revision of the laws of the United States were authorized by congress in 1866, those relating to the District were not included. But the commission, of its own accord, collected and revised them. Congress gave its sanction, thus bringing into operation the revised statutes of 1874. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 3, p. 127.

The city authorities were more helpful in this particular to their constituents than congress was to the country at large, for in addition to printing each year the ordinances of the city council, they provided that a digest of the laws of the corporation, prepared by William Hewitt, the register of the city, be published at city expense. This was done for the first time in 1818. The second digest was issued five years later, edited by Samuel Burch, under the authority of the city council, and then ten years passed before the third digest, prepared by Andrew Rothwell, was issued.

The value of the reputation of the city as a desirable place of residence naturally made a strong appeal to the self-interest of the citizens. Much concern was shown in regard to the tendency to ascribe the death of strangers occurring in the city to the unhealthfulness of the place, and as a consequence the city was said to be looked upon as a hotbed of contagion.[1] It was pointed out in 1816, by the writer of a communication in the *Intelligencer*, that the remedy lay in the appointment of a health officer to keep a register of diseases and deaths.[2] In his annual message a few weeks later the mayor, Dr. Blake, who was a practising physician, recommended the creation of such an office and the keeping of a record of deaths as productive "of beneficial consequences in demonstrating the salubrity of our situation and correcting many gross misrepresentations often industriously circulated by weak or designing men."[1] The following year the mayor renewed this suggestion, and two years later the city council passed a law creating such an officer, who was not only to keep a record of deaths, but also to report to the mayor the existence of nuisances dangerous to health.[2] No salary was provided, but a small allowance was made for contingent expenses. The first health officer was Dr. Henry Huntt, a native of Maryland, and secretary of the Medical Society of the District, which a few months previously had been given a charter by congress.[3] It had authority to appoint a medical board of examiners, whose certificate or license was necessary before the practice of medicine or surgery in the District could be carried on. In this way for the first time the practice of medicine was placed under regulation. In further recognition of the standing of regular medical practitioners, the city council, in its legislation creating a health officer, stipulated that he should be a member of the medical society.[4] After a service of three years Dr. Huntt became a member of the board of health, which succeeded to the powers of the health officer. One physician and one citizen not a physician for each of the six wards constituted the board. The health department did not fail to justify one object of its creation, as each year returns were made of the deaths occurring in the city and the causes.[5] When it was found the death-rate was decreasing and there were not as many cases of fever as formerly, the theory was regarded as confirmed that the marsh land, by that time drained and filled along the course of the canal east of 6th Street, had been responsible for much of the sickness of the earlier period.[1] At this period the city council made its first appropriation for providing trees to adorn the streets.[2] There had been previous legislation on the subject, but no use of public money, as all that had been attempted was an ordinance imposing penalties for injuries done to the trees planted in 1803 by direction of Jefferson along Pennsylvania Avenue between the capitol and the treasury department. It is quite evident the trees had suffered from carelessness, as the new law provided not only for replacing them, but also fines for those who permitted their horses to wander at will about the city or who found the trees convenient hitching-posts.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 21, 1816.

[2] The same.

---

[1] Jour. Com. Coun., Vol. 4, June 17, 1816.

[2] City Ordinance, Aug. 14, 1819.

[3] The society was organized in the fall of 1817, and a meeting called to consider the subject was attended by Drs. B. S. Bohrer, J. H. Blake, George Clark, Robert French, John Harrison, Thomas Henderson, Samuel Horsley, Henry Huntt, James T. Johnson, William Jones, J. P. C. McMahon, Alex. McWilliams, Thomas Sim, Peregrine Warfield, Charles and Nicholas Worthington. All the above named except Dr. McMahon, with the addition of Drs. John T. Shaaf, Fredrick May, Joel T. Gustine, Elisha Harrison, Richard Weightman and George May, became the incorporators of the society by the charter of Feb. 16, 1819. History of the Medical Society, p. 3.

[4] The Washington society was the twelfth organized in this country. Neither of the other two District towns had a health officer until 1832, when Georgetown made provision for such a functionary.

[5] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 271. Included in the annual statements of the material progress of the city, prepared during a series of years by

Even this limited use of public funds for such a purpose, as no other street was set out with trees,[3] was unusual in American towns of the day. In fact, as a commentator on city affairs observed, "the corporation, stimulated by a desire to promote the comfort and convenience of the inhabitants and to render the city what it ought to be, has gone so far in forwarding the general improvement of the city as to render itself nearly bankrupt." [4] The extent to which this unusual civic activity was carried is manifest from an official city advertisement calling for bids for furnishing, planting and boxing 400 trees on Pennsylvania Avenue between 1st and 15th streets.

John Sessford, "the volunteer annalist," as the *Intelligencer* termed him, were the figures from the health office. In 1820 the deaths were 327 in a population of 13,474, or about 24 in the thousand; in 1825 the population was 16,016, the deaths 225 and the rate 14, while in 1830 the deaths were 339 in a population of 18,830 and the rate 18. The modern rate, as, for example, that of 1911, was 17.80.

[1] Mayor Seaton, in his annual message (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 8, 1845), gives the death-rate for that year as 14, which he stated shows "that Washington enjoys a higher degree of salubrity than either of the large cities of the north and is not surpassed in this respect by any considerable city in the union."

[2] City Ordinance, Aug. 3, 1815.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 5, 1820.

[4] The same, May 13, 1819.

The sycamore, it is stated, was the species preferred.[1] The voice of the member of congress, especially when raised in complaint, had an influence in city affairs. One November evening in the year 1818 a member of the house with a friend left their lodgings in the vicinity of Davis Hotel and walked up Pennsylvania Avenue to make a call at Strother's Hotel.[2] When the visit was completed and the callers started to return along Pennsylvania Avenue to their lodgings, owing, as the legislator explained in a newspaper communication,[3] to the darkness it was difficult to see the footway. At times they slipped into the gutter or stumbled against a bank of earth. But even when with care they kept their feet from straying, then they fell over barrels or a pile of bricks. In the future, the writer assured his readers, he would not venture out again in the evening; although, he asks, is it not hard that having been confined in his seat in the hall of legislation all day, he must keep to his room in the evening? He might as well be in prison, is his conclusion; only he points to a possible way out by calling attention to the lamp-posts on the avenue which he recalls a winter or two ago were usually lighted. "Why are they not lighted now?" he asks; but has no word of criticism of the municipal government that allowed the sidewalk on the main thoroughfare of the town to be littered up with bricks and barrels.

It may have been a mere coincidence, but a year later an appropriation was made by the city council to provide oil for street lamps, some of which had been erected along Pennsylvania Avenue as early as 1803. While the lamp-posts were in place the money to pay for the lighting was not provided each year, although an exception was made in 1817, which the aggrieved member of congress had in mind when he wrote his mildly worded protest. No doubt the response of the city authorities to this criticism was due to their sensitiveness to opinion, especially of the congressional type. Still the law of 1819 providing for street lighting marked the second stage in this municipal enterprise, and appropriations for this purpose were made with fair regularity for some ten years thereafter. It may be added that for a town the size of Washington at that period, even a limited provision of that sort from the general revenue was not usual, as it was commonly made a charge on the property holder by means of a special tax.[1] In 1816, three years before the city fathers, apparently largely because of the force of opinion on Capitol Hill, conformed to the practice in other towns of that period and saw to it that the streets were lighted, an effort was made to introduce the new illuminant, carburetted hydrogen gas, such as had been in use in London for several years. At that time gas street lighting was unknown in this country. It was proposed to form a Washington gas company.[2]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 24, 1821.

[2] This was the corner house of a row of six two-story-and-attic houses at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, erected by John Tayloe (*Intelligencer*, April 17 and Dec. 9, 1816), and opened as a hotel by Joshua Tennison a few months previous (*Intelligencer*, March 17, 1818). Associated with him was John Strother, who soon became the sole proprietor (*Intelligencer*, June 24, 1818) and continued there for six years and gradually included as a part of the hotel the other houses in the row. Washington Hotel, on the same square to the west, was under the management of John McLeod until he became the proprietor of the old Tunnicliff Hotel (*Intelligencer*, Jan. 3, 1815). He was succeeded in the Washington Hotel by Pendleton Heronimus (*Intelligencer*, July 6, 1815) and then by Joshua Tennision (*Intelligencer*, April 24, 1817).

[3] *City of Washington Gazette*, Nov. 23, 1818.

The appeal to citizens to take stock failed, owing no doubt in part to their narrow circumstances, as that was the reason twenty-five years later, when the Washington Gas Light Co. was organized, that the majority of the stock was taken by non-residents. Congress was therefore not called upon to give its sanction to this new device, as would have been the case if the company had been formed in order to get authority to lay the pipes in the streets. The city council of Philadelphia in 1822, six years after the organization of a Washington company was proposed, had such an application before it. The use of the streets was refused because the "councils had no desire to encourage an innovation so dangerous, so offensive and one likely to injure the business of candle makers and oil dealers."[1] Some months after the failure of the gas company project, public notice was given of an entertainment to be held in the ball-room of Davis Hotel, "which will be brilliantly illuminated with gass lights."[2] Other buildings from time to time were lighted by gas produced either from wood or coal in an apparatus on the premises, the process being offensively odorous throughout the entire vicinity. Gas for street lighting did not come until the Washington Gas Light Co. was formed in 1848, although it was adopted in New York and Boston in the early '20's and in Baltimore in 1817.

---

[1] There were no street lamps in Georgetown except as provided by the ordinance of 1810, which were maintained by a special tax paid by contiguous property holders.

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 31, 1816. The writer stated that "in the year 1804 Mr. Benjamin Henfry made experiments in Washington city and illuminated the chambers and passages of a house in Pennsylvania Avenue and the lamp in front of the house with gas."

The perils of Pennsylvania Avenue at this period were not confined to the night-time; for, as the author of a communication in the *Intelligencer* stated, several persons, while passing along Pennsylvania Avenue near 2d Street northwest about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, "narrowly escaped being shot by a careless fellow who was sporting with his gun on the south side of the canal."[3] The lower section of the avenue had a desolate appearance. There were no houses or brick sidewalks. For on the south side from 6th Street to the capitol and on the north side from 4½ Street or John Marshall Place to 2d Street all the land belonged to the government, and like the other public property, with the exception of the grounds immediately about the capitol, was entirely neglected. The avenue was closely bordered on the south side by the canal and the Tiber, and beyond lay the tangled vegetation of a swamp. On the north side was a high ridge.

The city government spent money on the roadway of Pennsylvania Avenue, as that was drawn from the tax fund. But the cost of the sidewalks was assessed against the abutting property, except, of course, that owned by the government.[1] As a result the lower section of Pennsylvania Avenue, bordered as it was by public property, was without the brick sidewalk of the time. As the members of congress, as the years went on, gradually shifted their places of abode from Capitol Hill to the main section of Pennsylvania Avenue, at first centred in the vicinity of 6th Street, extending gradually westward as far as the White House and also to the north, the state of the avenue between this centre and the capitol became a matter of personal and unpleasant experiences. When it was found that improvements ended when public ownership began, then congress, by the law of Feb. 24, 1817, did what, for that day, appeared to be the obvious thing, and proposed to substitute, in part at least, private for public ownership. The law directed the subdivision into lots and the sale of a portion of the frontage of the reservation popularly called the Bank Square on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 3d Street and John Marshall Place. For the first time congress decided to sell outright land that was supposed by citizens to have been acquired with the condition of use only for public purposes, but which in point of fact, as a few years later the Supreme Court decided, the government held in absolute ownership.[2] With a cautiousness that was not warranted by the state of the market, the law stipulated that only each alternate lot was to be sold. There was a further condition, hedging the proposed sales, that purchasers of lots within three years were to build three-story brick houses at least twenty-five feet front. The property was duly advertised for sale by the commissioner of public buildings.[3] A few months later, as the lots did not go, the device of an auction sale was resorted to and some of the lots were sold at an average price of 47 cents per square foot.[1] This attempt on the part of congress to improve the principal approach to the capitol had opponents. But no constitutional questions were raised or even objections on the score of the expediency of disposing of public property instead of a direct appropriation. The opposition came from the hack drivers, who feared if sidewalks were laid, the public would walk instead of riding.[2] The writer of the newspaper communication making this charge inveighed against the exorbitant fees of the hackmen. For while the rates were fixed by city ordinance as early as 1806, and there was further legislation on the subject, yet it is apparent the hackmen were not controlled. The entire transportation system was in their hands and remained there for years, as no stage or omnibus line was started, after the pioneer attempt in 1800, until the year 1830.[3] How completely the law of 1817 failed in its purpose is shown by the selection of this very square, three years later, by a commission as a site for the city hall building. While the commission failed to get the approval of the president and so the Judiciary Square site was chosen, yet it is quite evident no improvements had been made in that square and also that the government had not parted permanently with its title to any of the lots. In authorizing the 1822 plan of improvements, however, this square was directed to be sold "except such parts thereof as have already been sold."

---

[1] McMaster, Vol. 5, p. 127.
[2] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 24, 1817.
[3] June 6, 1818.

---

[1] Since the year 1814, when brick sidewalks were first laid in the city, the cost had always been levied as a special assessment against the property. Street improvements then and for many years later, paid for out of the tax fund, were confined to levelling the roadway and covering the surface with gravel.

[2] Van Ness *et al. vs.* the city of Washington and the United States, 4 Peters 232.

[3] *Intelligencer*, April 11, 1817.

At the time the announcement of the decision of the city hall commission was made, the *City of Washington Gazette* of July 20, 1820, in commending this selection, said: "This determination will meet the idea of congress, which has always been desirous of seeing this hiatus of our city (Reservation No. 10) improved and which has hitherto had the effect of cutting off the intercourse between the western and eastern section of the city, particularly during the sessions of congress in the winter season. This universal inconvenience may now be obviated and an uninterrupted paved walk enjoyed from the capitol to the President's House." The forlorn as well as unwholesome surroundings of Pennsylvania Avenue in this section were early attributed mainly to the location of the canal. When Latrobe resumed his place as architect of the capitol in 1815, he prepared a sketch plan showing a proposed arrangement and treatment of the grounds about the capitol.[1] A leading feature was a change in the course of the Tiber so that it would cross Pennsylvania Avenue at 1st Street, and then entering the Mall midway between Pennsylvania Avenue and Maryland Avenue pass directly down the centre to 3d Street, where it would flow into the canal. The law of 1817 was similar in its intent to that of 1812 relating to the use of public reservations, and was quite as futile. Both sought to encourage local improvements, but without any recognition of responsibility on the part either of the government as a property holder or of the city as the Federal centre. Then the citizens were aroused into action. A movement was started that ended sixty years later in the sharing of municipal expenses by the general and local governments. At the outset in the year 1818 citizens had merely the suggestive attitude. They realized that the great stretch of reservations as well as the open places formed by the transverse avenues cutting through the rectangular street system ought to be improved and adorned with shrubbery and trees. It was also realized that such things were beyond the city revenue, and so in a memorial to congress that body was asked to improve this species of property and place it under the care of the commissioner of public buildings.[2] As the event proved, this suggestion was many years ahead of the times. A partial recognition of the principle of the responsibility of the government as a landowner was made two years later in the charter of the city of 1820, when it was provided that the United States should pay its proportion of the cost of street and sidewalk improvements in front of public squares or reservations; but as the only provision for money was the uncertain one of the proceeds of the public lots, the benefit to the city was extremely limited. Two years after the last of these attempts made by congress to improve city conditions, and more especially Pennsylvania Avenue near the capitol, it was declared in the senate by John H. Eaton of Tennessee, who the following session had as colleague, Andrew Jackson, a warm personal friend, that the avenue was impassable for horse or foot.[1] Was it creditable, he asked, representing a class that has always been in both houses of congress, as the votes on District measures from the beginning attest, although the debates do not always reveal their presence, that the main avenue of the seat of government should be in this condition? It would not be a sufficient answer, he asserted, to say the people of the city might make the needed improvements, for he understood the taxes levied on them were already heavier than the taxes which were paid by the people of the states at any period of the late war.[2] He was of the opinion that the government ought to maintain the main avenue of the city, so that it could be used at all seasons of the year. It was not merely for the convenience of members of congress in passing from the capitol to the executive departments, that the expenditure of federal money was advocated, as was the case in 1800 when the first and only congressional appropriation up to that time for streets in the city was made, but because it was not creditable to the Nation that its capital city should be in such a condition, and it was not fair to the people of the city that the entire burden of the maintenance of a capital city should be left on their shoulders. However, congress declared no policy, but later on, from time to time, by appropriations for local purposes, made what was in reality a contribution to the common tax fund, but it was irregular and fitful and could not be depended upon in making up the annual city budget, and for that reason lost in effectiveness.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 2, 1817.

[2] The same, Jan. 18, 1816.

[3] The same, Feb. 27, 1830.

---

[1] Reproduced in History of the Capitol, p. 50.

[2] Annals of Congress, p. 256, March 10, 1818.

The Eaton comment, an interesting early expression of the relations between congress and the District, was called out by a resolution to provide a sidewalk along Pennsylvania Avenue from the capitol to Georgetown. The previous fall another plan for the improvement of the avenue was outlined in a resolution adopted by the city council[1] to memorialize congress to authorize the Washington Canal Co. to change to the centre of the Mall the section of the canal then bordering the avenue from 3d to 6th streets and to vest the lots fronting on the avenue in the corporation with the view of reimbursing the company, the balance to be used as congress may direct. Two reasons were advanced in support of this request. One was to effect an improvement in the health of the city by doing away with the marsh. The second was the financial inability either of the city or the canal company to do the work. Three months later this recommendation, but with a wider scope, was incorporated by congress in the law of May 7, 1822. Not only was the city corporation authorized to sell the three reservations on the north side of the avenue, but also the entire stretch of the Mall from 6th to 3d streets and between Pennsylvania Avenue and Maryland Avenue with the exception of the central portion, to which the waters of the canal were to be brought. The section of the Mall retained, as well as that east of 3d Street, was to be improved.[2] The land subdivided was to be sold with the condition of building, and in this way this section of the avenue was to be built up, thus uniting "the two parts of the city between Capitol Hill and the centre of the city where most of the mercantile and other business is transacted."[3]

---

[1] Annals of Congress, p. 179, Feb. 5, 1822.

[2] The tax rate was increased in 1808 from 25 to 50 cents on the hundred dollars and then again in 1824 to 56 cents. Seven years later an advance was made to 75 cents. The assessed value was theoretically at least the market value.

The property to be sold included all the lots in the bank square remaining unsold and the two squares to the east, one of which was intended as a site for the mint,[4] and which were bounded by 2d and 3d streets, Pennsylvania Avenue and C and B streets. In addition four squares carved out of the Mall, two on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 3d and 6th streets and two on the north side of Maryland Avenue between the same streets, were to be sold.

---

[1] Nov. 2, 1821.

[2] *Washington Gazette*, Feb. 12, 1822.

[3] *Intelligencer*, July 19, 1822.

[4] An effort was made in the year 1808 to have the mint removed from Philadelphia to Washington. (Annals of Congress, 10th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1829.) But its location at that time was not the main issue. The policy of continuing it so divided opinion that it was not until some six years after congress had disposed of the proposed site in Washington that the practice of prolonging the existence of the mint for periods of one to five years was given up. An earlier attempt to remove the military academy from West Point to the national

The work was done under the direction of a commission appointed by the city council, which sold the lots, and after satisfying the demands of the canal company, attempted with the balance to enclose and plant the middle section of the Mall west of 3d Street and open two streets on the north and south sides parallel with Pennsylvania and Maryland avenues from 3d to 6th streets, upon which the city council bestowed the names of Missouri and Maine streets.[1] It is quite evident only a portion of the work was done from the funds of the commission. A part of the cost fell upon the purchasers of the lots, who were not exempt from the common liability of property holders of that period.[2] As it turned out, this use of public property, while it secured the change in the course of the canal, some improvement in the public grounds, the building up of a portion of that section of Pennsylvania Avenue and providing sidewalks and gutters, yet it served again to impress on the minds of those who kept in touch with city affairs the narrowness of the real estate market. Not more than one-third of what was held to be the real value of the land was obtained.[3] Owing to the limited demand, the commission suspended the further sale of lots. In the course of seven years 122 lots out of a total of 157 were sold and $58,000 realized, or an average of $369 per lot.[4]

---

capital had also failed. (Annals of Congress, 9th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 36, 1805.)

[1] City Ordinance, March 23, 1826. These designations remain, except avenue has been substituted for street.

[2] City Ordinance, Sept. 25, 1823. Imposing a special tax for the sidewalk on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between John Marshall Place and 1st Street.

[3] *Intelligencer*, July 19, 1822. "The ground on this avenue has hitherto sold for a dollar per foot and till this public reservation was authorized to be sold, none could be obtained even at that."

[4] Report of R. C. Weightman, president of the board of commissioners, 20th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 55, April 3, 1829. The

No doubt the average was effected because of the higher figures paid for the lots immediately east of 6th Street, thus anticipating, what really happened, their inclusion within the area of the principal business section. Up to the year 1821 the average price of the public lots sold in the previous thirty years was $180 per lot.[1] Seven years later the average price had fallen to $87 per lot, and at that time there remained 3350 of the 10,136 lots originally assigned to the public.[2] The state of the market for lots finds another illustration in the appropriations made by congress in the years 1824 and 1825 for providing sidewalks on Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the public grounds. For the commissioner of public buildings had authority to defray such charges from the money derived from the sale of public lots. It is quite evident there was no money available from that source.

While the population of the city steadily increased, the settled portions were for many years small zones in the vast area within the city limits. Property values showed this disproportion. The situation was not realized either by the citizens or by congress, or if it was, they were buoyed up by sanguine hopes, which in the first quarter or third of the century were a part of the optimism natural in a country which was developing at a marvellous rate. As late as the year 1820 a committee of the house, in giving an account of expenditures in rebuilding the public buildings and finding that already over a million dollars had been spent, nearly equal to the total expenditures prior to 1814, felt assured that this money "can only be considered, for the most part, advances made at the treasury, which will be reimbursed by sales of the public property in the city of Washington." Of the sufficiency of this fund for its object, namely, the erection of all the public buildings, the committee felt no doubt.[3] This point of view is the one

---

other members were James Hoban, Adam Lindsay and George Watterston.

[1] Report of Commissioner of Public Buildings, 17th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 9, Dec. 26, 1821.

[2] The same, 20th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 166, Feb. 4, 1828.

[3] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 578.

that is commonly found in estimates of the value of the public property, and especially in the debit and credit accounts of government expenditures and receipts in the District that was made use of for many years in the discussions on District affairs. For the most part the valuation of the public lots for such purposes had but little relation to their actual or market value.

Yet in the face of the experience of over a quarter of a century of the lack of demand for the public lots and the disappointing results in offering for sale the public ground on Pennsylvania Avenue, congress was still sanguine enough to believe that public lots could be changed into money. When in the year 1832 it was desired to vest in the corporation of Washington all the rights and privileges of the Washington Canal Co., so that the waterway would be controlled and managed by the municipality instead of a company, congress not only granted such a charter, but to enable the town to acquire the canal property, actually transferred to the city government the entire Mall from 6th to 15th streets except the central section between A Street, north and south. The law directed that this land, aggregating about thirty-five acres, be divided into lots and sold and the proceeds used to defray the cost of acquiring and improving the canal and also to continue the reclamation of the swamp.[1] At the next session, however, what would now be regarded as a grant of almost regal proportions was withdrawn and a money appropriation of $150,000 was substituted.[2]

This sudden reversal might have been due to a very natural lack of confidence that the land would produce such a sum. There was also a broader motive, for in recommending the substitution of money for land the committee on public buildings informed the house, that if this land is built upon, it will destroy the beauty of the original design of the reservation and will in the future, when the population becomes more dense, be "a subject of regret as depriving the inhabitants of a delightful source of recreation and diminishing the salubrity of the city."[1]

---

[1] Stats., 4, 524, May 31, 1832. Six weeks later the city council passed an ordinance directing the city surveyor to divide into lots of 25 feet front all this land. Ordinance, July 17, 1832.

[2] Stats., 4, 651, March 2, 1833.

Congress not only retained the land, but appropriated $5000 to enclose with a fence the Mall still lying open and waste, to plant grass and lay out walks. While this provision was entirely inadequate and was not followed up by further grants of money, yet it marks the beginning of a policy that in the course of years has made that great reservation as well as other public property in the city beautiful and health-giving bits of country in the midst of city streets.

Although, as was declared in 1828, six years after the low grounds improvement, "the original site of the canal is now terra firma and ranges of houses have arisen where the water once flowed,"[2] the full benefit to the city was not secured. Some of the purchasers failed to comply with the building conditions imposed by the commissioners, and in consequence the latter refused to give deeds. Then they neglected to pay the taxes, and as no conveyance could be given under a tax sale, the title being still in the government, the city was deprived of its revenue. For years portions of the property continued under the depression of a cloud in the title.[3] However, the new section of the canal in the Mall from 6th Street to 3d Street was described with poetic license as "a beautiful sheet of water walled on both sides and bearing on its ample bosom boats with the produce of the surrounding country."[4] The principle of federal sharing in municipal expenses, first given recognition by congress in the clause in the city charter of 1820 directing the use of the city lot fund to pay for street improvements in front of public property, had a slow development. Ten years later the District committee of the house in a report favoring the paving of Pennsylvania Avenue at government expense, stated, in reply to what had even at that time become a stock objection to appropriations for the city, namely, that the objects were purely local, and should be paid for out of the city funds, that the city was already suffering under a pressure of local taxation, one of the causes for which was that the large realty holdings of the government were exempt from taxation, although their value had been increased by the extensive improvements made by the city government.[1] Five years later, and nearly twenty years after the suggestion to congress that it improve public grounds had been made by the city council, that body came out in favor of the plan of having the property of the United States in the city assessed and taxed.[2]

---

[1] 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 63, Jan. 22, 1833.

[2] *Intelligencer*, April 26, 1828.

[3] The same, Aug. 8, 1845. Message of the mayor.

[4] Trenton, True American. Reprinted in the *Intelligencer*, April 26, 1828.

In support of the justice of such a proposition a valuation was made, by assessors appointed by the corporation, of the property in the city belonging to the United States with the exception of building lots and streets and avenues. The total value of the land and buildings was reported to be $6,978,000,[3] and as the assessed value of the city was $6,750,000, the United States was shown to be the largest property holder. Although, as the city increased in size, the total of the value of public property relatively diminished, this basis for adjusting fiscal relations with the District continued to figure largely in the discussions both in and out of congress. Its continued prominence and importance were no doubt largely owing to the fact that it really seemed to many to offer the only practical solution. For it was more easily comprehended and was decidedly more concrete than the federal character of the District as the seat of government. While the improvements along the lower section of Pennsylvania Avenue were in progress, making that thoroughfare and its surroundings better adapted for a federal centre as well as for the needs of a growing community, another provision to the same end was made when the use of signs giving the names of the streets was begun. At first the placing of boards bearing the names of the streets and fastened on the corner house or houses was limited by ordinance to the cross streets on Pennsylvania Avenue, but a more general provision was soon authorized,[1] which was slowly made use of. No doubt this convenience was suggested or its need emphasized by the issue in 1822 of the first general directory for the city, which gave "the name, occupation and residence of each head of a family and person in business and the names of the members of congress and where they board." [2]

---

[1] 21st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 184, Feb. 10, 1830.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 6, 1835. Resolution requesting the committee representing the interest of the corporation before congress to present to congress a petition to that effect.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 27, 1837.

The locations given in this 12mo book were by streets only, as house numbers were still thirty-two years in the future. A publication of a directory was proposed, as early as the fall of 1815, by Jonathan Elliot.[3] The public was informed that the Washington Guide was "in the press and to be published next month"; but if it was printed, no copy of it has been preserved. Seven years later what was apparently the same project materialized, but without the directory feature. It is the first in the long list of Washington guide-books.[4] Besides information about the city this little volume contained a list of plants in the District, prepared by Dr. J. A. Brereton, who was an assistant surgeon in the United States army and one of the organizers of the Washington Botanical Society formed in 1817.[5]

The catalogue of plants in the Washington Guide was based on the work of the society, which had three years before published a fourteen-page pamphlet giving a list of 296 species of flowering plants in the District.[1] Editions of the Washington Guide were published in 1826, 1830 and 1837, and in all, this feature was retained. In the year 1830 the flora of the District was published in separate form, a 16mo book of 86 pages, containing the names of 860 species of plants, compiled by Dr. John A. Brereton.[2] Dr. Alexander McWilliams, one of the organizers and active members of the society, submitted in the spring of 1826 to the Columbian Institute a list of plants of the District, which was read but not published.[3] Five years later an ambitious scheme for the publication of a botanical periodical, the first thing of the sort attempted in this country, was carried out. It had the name of the *American Botanical Register* and was edited by William Rich and John A. Brereton. It was to be a monthly, but there was an interval of two months between the first and second issues.[4] There is no record that the publication was continued beyond the third or possibly the fourth number. This pioneer in the field of American botanical periodical literature, both in its appearance and material, deserved a better fate.[5] At the time the improvement of what was commonly spoken of as the low grounds was begun, the immediate surroundings of the capitol were limited by a circular road that passed about midway between the building and 1st Street west. Between this road and 1st Street, south of the main western approach to the capitol, lay a section of the public grounds assigned by the president to the Columbian Institute to be used as a botanical garden.[1] While the society was organized in 1816 by a number of citizens for the purpose of promoting the arts and sciences,[2] and had been incorporated two years later by congress,[3] there is no record that anything had been done towards starting the Botanic Garden until the work of draining the low grounds was begun after 1822.[4] It may be concluded that owing to the spreading out of the waters of the Tiber the ground was not in a condition to be used, as probably the morass came up within a short distance of the capitol building. Two years after the work of the commission started, the area of the garden was enlarged, and a year later it is spoken of as enclosed.[5] In 1836, a couple of years before the twenty-year charter of the society expired and it went out of existence, all of the ground used for a botanic garden was restored to public use, as at that time the western enclosure of the capitol grounds was advanced to its present location on 1st Street. The society estimated it had expended $1500 "in draining, fencing and planting with shrubs and trees and several gravel walks," [6] and asked congress to reimburse that sum.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 18, 1826. City Ordinance, July 28, 1826.

[2] From title page of the Washington Directory, Judah Delano, 1822.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 11, 1815.

[4] Washington Guide by William Elliot. S. A. Elliot, Washington, 1822.

[5] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 5, p. 176. Early Botanical Activity in the District, by Frederick V. Coville. The officers of the society for the first year were Rev. Dr. James Laurie, president; Samuel Eliot, Jr., 1st vice president; George Watterston, secretary; John Boyle, treasurer; Drs. Alex. McWilliams, John A. Brereton and Henry Huntt, curators. In addition to the above the following signed the constitution: W. A. Bradley, J. M. Moore, J. W. Hand, William Elliot, James Kearney and John Underwood. The society continued in existence until 1825.

---

[1] Florula Columbiensis. Washington, Jacob Gideon, Jr., 1819. The first list of District plants was made by C. S. Rafinesque, an eccentric but talented naturalist who visited Washington in 1804. Announcement was made of this catalogue the following year, but it was not published. (Rafinesque, a Sketch of his Life and Bibliography. T. J. Fitzpatrick, Des Moines, 1911.) My attention was called to Rafinesque's project by Dr. Joseph N. Rose, botanist, Smithsonian Institution. The second list was prepared by D. B. Warden in 1811 and published in a Chorographical Description of the D. C. Paris, 1816.

[2] Floræ Columbianæ etc., Washington, Jonathan Elliot, 1830. The second separate issue of the flora of the District.

[3] List of papers read before the Institute from April, 1821, to March 16, 1827. *Intelligencer*, Nov. 30, 1827.

[4] *Intelligencer*, May 8, 1831. Notice of the appearance of the first issue, and in the *Intelligencer* of July 4, 1831, the second was announced. The first three issues are in the library of the Surgeon General's Office and the first two issues in the Agricultural Department Library.

[5] The printing was excellent, and each number giving a description of a plant had an engraved plate hand colored. The engraver was W. S. Pendleton and the printer J. A. M. Duncanson. It resembled the contemporary English periodical of the same name.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 1, 1820, and Aug. 30, 1837.

[2] The same, Aug. 15, 1816. Account of the first meeting held June 28, 1816, at McKeowins Hotel. The name first selected was Metropolitan Association. At a meeting held Aug. 8, a constitution was adopted and the name changed to Columbian Institute. A committee was appointed to act until the time for the election of officers as follows: Rev. Dr. Andrew Hunter, Dr. Edward Cutbush, Dr. Alexander McWilliams, Nathaniel Cutting, and Benjamin Henry Latrobe.

[3] The incorporators were Edward Cutbush, Andrew Hunter, Thomas Law, Joseph Anderson, Robert Brent, Overton Carr, Nathaniel Cutting, Elias B. Caldwell, John Law, Roger C. Weightman, William Thornton, Josiah Meigs, James H. Blake and Samuel H. Smith.

[4] *Intelligencer*, March 24, 1824.

[5] The same, Aug. 10, 1825.

[6] 24th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 226., Feb. 14, 1837. Memorial of the Institute. *Intelligencer*, Aug. 30, 1837.

This modest request was not granted, although in its memorial to congress it stated that it was the intention to use the money in erecting a building where the Institute could hold its meetings and where exhibitions could be given of the works of American artists in sculpture and in painting.

In addition to the use of the public grounds granted to the Institute, it received from congress, in part at least, the recognition which was evidently in the mind of Dr. Edward Cutbush, the first president of the society, and who with Thomas Law was a leader in its organization.[1] Then a room was assigned for the use of the Institute in the capitol building under the library. But beyond these provisions the fostering care of the government was not extended to the Institute. The thought of the founders as to its scope may be inferred from a contemporary account of the purposes of the Institute, which were not alone to establish a botanic garden, but "when its funds will authorize the important undertaking, the erection of a building for a national museum and library."[2] During the twenty years of its career the society collected books, minerals and works of art, and in 1841, three years after it had gone out of existence, the members accepted an invitation from the National Institution, organized for similar objects, to become members and to make it the custodian of its property. The early interest shown in scientific study and research by residents of the District, which found expression in the organization of the Washington Botanical Society and the Columbian Institute, was due not alone to the cultivated, professional and business men of the city, but also to those in the government service. The medical officers of the army and navy were represented in both organizations. Dr. McWilliams, at one time a surgeon in the navy, became a practising physician of the city, one of the incorporators of the medical society, but so in love with natural science, especially botany, that it is said of him, his professional work became a secondary interest.[1] In the work of the two societies he was associated with fellow medical practitioners like Edward Cutbush, a surgeon in the navy and a teacher and active promoter of science, James H. Blake, John A. Brereton and Henry Huntt. From the ranks of the government employés came such men as John Underwood, Rev. James Laurie, Joseph Anderson, Nathaniel Cutting, J. M. Moore, J. W. Hand, Elias B. Caldwell, William Thronton, William Elliot, John Boyle and James Kearney. The bankers of the city were represented by Overton Carr, Samuel H. Smith and W. A. Bradley, and the lawyers by Thomas Law and John Law. George Watterston, also a member, had given up law and was then librarian of congress.

---

[1] Genesis of the U. S. National Museum, 1893, p. 276. The objects of the society are stated in the address of Dr. Cutbush printed in pamphlet form. Washington, 1817.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 1, 1820.

However, in the organization and work of the Columbian Institute there was laid the foundation upon which a noble institution was destined to rise, "for the germ of the Smithsonian idea may be found in Cutbush's address, and his spirit was kindred to that of Henry and his associates, who worked under more favorable conditions thirty years later." [2]

---

[1] History of Medical Society, p. 216.

[2] G. Brown Goode, Genesis of the U. S. National Museum, p. 279.

CHAPTER II

CAPITOL FINISHED IN MARBLE

The scheme and purpose of the reclamation of the swamp just beyond the borders of the capitol grounds on the west and the improvement of the section of Pennsylvania Avenue bordering it begun in 1822 was in keeping with the general character of the public edifices as rebuilt. An expanse of lawn adorned with trees and shrubbery would make a more suitable setting for such a structure as the capitol than a tangled, unsightly marsh. The principal approach was to be changed from the desolation of a neglected country road to a thoroughfare lined with buildings and having the orderly curb and sidewalk of a street in a well-kept town. The capitol building was rebuilt along the same lines as that of the first building, but more costly and elaborate in its interior details. In place of colonnades and staircases of freestone and floors of brick, marble was used, while the capitals of the marble pillars were carved in Italy, and Italian sculptors were brought to this country and in some cases kept at work for ten years. The two Italian sculptors, Giuseppe Franzoni and Giovanni Andrei, who had worked on the first building, were retained in the service. Andrei soon died and his place was taken by a countryman, Valaperti.[1] Carlo Franzoni, a brother of Giuseppe, and Francesco Cardello, a cousin, came from Italy and began work in 1816. Six years later Enrico Causici and Antonio Capellano of Italy, pupils of Canova, and Nicholas Gevelot, of

---

[1] Report of Commissioner of Public Buildings. (*Intelligencer*, May 6, 1816.) Franzoni designed the clock and Valaperti the stone eagle in the house. (The same, Nov. 29, 1816.) In the course of a few months Valaperti mysteriously disappeared and it was supposed drowned himself. (The same, March 10, 1817.)

France, joined the artist colony, and later on came Luigi Persico, also an Italian artist.[1]

For a little more than two years the work had been in progress, when the time came for the inauguration of James Monroe. The sessions of the 14th congress then just ended had been held in the temporary structure known as the Brick Capitol, where also the 15th congress met. There Monroe would have been inaugurated on the 4th of March, 1817, only the senate committee on arrangements met with an unexpected check. Application was made to Henry Clay, the speaker of the house, for the use of the chamber of the house. It was desired by the senate committee to have entire control, and it was the intention to place in the room for that occasion "the fine red chairs" from the senate. The speaker, whose permission was necessary, as the house was not in session, was opposed both to the exclusive authority desired and the doing away with the "plain democratic chairs" of the house.[2] The consequence was the senate committee erected "an elevated portico" in front of the building and there the oath was administered and the inaugural speech delivered in the open air for the first time since Washington's inauguration in New York City.

The president elect was escorted from his residence on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 20th and 21st streets, where he had lived as secretary of state, by citizens on horseback in accordance with a public notice signed by James H. Blake, mayor of Washington, and John Peter, mayor of Georgetown, the inaugural committee of the day.[3] In addition to the mounted citizens, the militia companies turned out, while never before had been seen in Washington such a concourse of spectators, as the number of persons who listened to the inaugural were estimated at from five to eight thousand.[4]

---

[1] History of the Capitol, p. 74.

[2] Statement of Henry Clay in the Senate. Register of Debates, Feb. 28, 1837, p. 992. Also *Intelligencer*, March 4, 1817. Annals of Congress, March 4, 1817, p. 220.

[3] *Intelligencer*, March 4, 1817.

[4] McMaster, Vol. 4, p. 377. The inaugural ball was held in the evening at Davis Hotel. List of managers chosen at a meeting of citizens. *Intelligencer*, Feb. 26 and 28, 1817.

Upon the conclusion of the ceremonies at the capitol the president returned to his residence, where he held a reception.[1] Two days after the inauguration James Madison, the retiring president, was presented at his residence, the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 19th Street, with an address by the citizens of Washington expressive of their appreciation of the interest which he had displayed in the city.[2] On the fourth anniversary of the day, in December, 1815, when congress assembled for the first time in the Brick Capitol, both houses met in the new capitol building. The corner-stone of the central portion was laid before the close of the third year,[3] and ten years after its destruction the entire building was declared to be practically finished.[4] For the first year the work was under the direction of a commission of three men who secured a loan of $500,000 from the Bank of Columbia and the Bank of Metropolis of Washington, the Union Bank of Alexandria and the Union Bank of Georgetown.[5] The services of B. H. Latrobe as architect of the capitol were secured by the commission. At the close of the first year the management was intrusted to a single official known as the commissioner of public buildings, and the commission as well as the office of superintendent of the city were abolished.[6] Thomas Munroe, who had for a number of years held the office of superintendent of the city as well as postmaster, was then able to give his entire time to the post-office. Richard Bland Lee, relieved of duties as member of the commission, continued as a member of the commission on claims for property destroyed during the war.[7] Tench Ringgold, another member of the commission, two years later received from President Monroe the important appointment of marshal of the District in place of Washington Boyd,[1] while the third member, John P. Van Ness, retired to private life. The administration of the new office of commissioner of public buildings was given to Col. Samuel Lane of Virginia, who died after a service of five years. Shortly after his successor, Joseph Elgar, was appointed, it was found there was a balance due the government of $15,590,[2] mainly arising from disbursements for furniture for the president's house. The political opponents of President Monroe were not slow in discovering that some of the money appropriated for furniture had been paid directly by Colonel Lane to the president. One of the members of the house wanted to make a report reflecting on the president, but the committee would not permit it. Apparently his colleagues had the same opinion of his motives as the president had, for when the latter received from this member a message asking if he would appear before the committee, the president not only declined to appear, but sent word to the author of the request that in the opinion of Mr. Monroe he was a scoundrel.[3] In the meantime the president explained his being mixed up with the accounts of the commissioner of public buildings. He had received a part of the money appropriated for furnishing the White House in consideration of furniture of his own which he had put in the White House until what had been ordered could be supplied. Then when his furniture was returned, the money was to be repaid. But the opportunity to attack the president was not neglected and the entire matter was ventilated in the newspapers, and then finally disposed of by a report of a house committee which merely explained that Colonel Lane was insolvent when he entered the army during the late war and that he was not considered a man of property when he was made commissioner.[4] At the same time the president was beginning to feel the pinch of his own narrowing circumstances which continued to hold him for the rest of his life.[1] Two years after he retired from the presidency a visitor found him is farm at work in the fields.[2] Colonel Lane did not get ng very well with Latrobe. A committee of the house also found fault with the architect because his estimates lacked detail and were not satisfactory.[3] It is not surprising that after less than two years Latrobe resigned. He was succeeded by Charles Bulfinch of Boston, the designer of the Massachuse state-house and of a number of churches and public structur His only work in this city, where he lived for twelve years, w the First Unitarian church edifice at the northeast corner of 6th and D streets, northwest.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 6, 1817.

[2] The same, March 11, 1817.

[3] The same, Aug. 26, 1818.

[4] 20th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 69, Feb. 4, 1829.

[5] *Intelligencer*, May 6, 1816. Report of the commission.

[6] Stats., 3, 324, April 29, 1816. Reports were made to congress from time to time by the commissioner, but not until 1830 were they made regularly each year.

[7] Three years later, upon the death of Robert Brent, he was appointed judge of the orphan court of Washington County.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 29, 1818.

[2] Annals of Congress, 18th Cong., 1st Sess., May 13, 1824, p. 2607.

[3] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 6, p. 287, April 10, 1824.

[4] Annals of Congress, May 13, 1824, p. 2607.

He was a man of refined taste and conservative in his architectural practice, and carried out with fidelity and without the restiveness of his predecessors the design of the building that had been determined upon and which was the plan of Thornton, approved by Washington, with some modifications devised by Latrobe and also by Bulfinch. The western entrance is the work of the Boston architect, while Latrobe made the entrance on the east the principal one, architecturally.[4] Latrobe also made a complete change in the form, design and details of the interior of the house wing and enlarged the space assigned the senate chamber.[5] When Latrobe found that neither in the quarry of freestone owned by the government on the lower Potomac nor in other localities was it possible to get material suitable for some of the interior details, he selected a variegated marble which was quarried along the Potomac in Montgomery County, Md., and Loudoun County, Va., forty miles from Washington. It was brought down the river and used in the colonnade of the house.[1] The difficulties of opening up the quarries in a thinly settled country proved to be causes of delay, while the marble columns for the colonnade in the senate, which were supplied from New York, were not promptly delivered. Then a combination was formed among the workmen in order to enforce a demand for increased pay, which apparently failed, after a suspension of the work for about a month.[2]

---

[1] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 6, p. 444, Dec. 24, 1824.

[2] The same, Vol. 7, p. 257, April 10, 1827.

[3] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 427, Feb. 18, 1817.

[4] History of the Capitol, p. 46. There is no explanation of why the capitol building was designed to stand with its back to the principal section of the city, for from an early date the centre of population was established between the capitol and the president's house.

[5] The same, p. 50.

A little more than a year after the work of rebuilding the capitol began an appropriation was made for enclosing and improving the grounds about the east front,[3] and the next year provision was made for continuing the work around on the west side, and thus within two years after the visit of the British a beginning had been made in providing a park about the capitol building, which in the highly developed state of to-day is the handsomest in the city. At that time, although the building was only partially erected, its occupation was begun, as a place had been prepared in the north wing as early as the summer of 1816 for a meeting-place for the circuit court of the District.[4] As apparently the offices of the clerk of the circuit court and of the marshal of the District were at the same time transferred from rented quarters to the capitol building, that structure became the centre of the judicial business of Washington County. No doubt the inconvenience arising from the scattered location of the court and its offices hastened the return to the unfinished capitol building, three years before that structure was ready for either house and in fact two years before the old court-room in that building had been restored. In this interval the business of congress had grown to such an extent that in the year 1818, only some twelve months before the houses sat for the first time in the restored building, a temporary brick structure for the use of committees was built in the grounds to the south.[1] The District was also growing and so was the business of its court. But the latter had no permanent home, and the lack of a building where the court and its offices as well as the city offices could be brought together in some central locality was recognized as early as 1815 as one of the three public needs of the city. At that time it was included with public school buildings and a building for a penitentiary as the purpose of a lottery authorized by congress. But the lottery scheme dragged, and a year later when the court had just gotten back in the capitol building a movement was started to raise by subscription money to erect a court-house on Judiciary Square.[2] The public was assured it would be merely a temporary loan, probably soon to be repaid by congress, and for which until refunded an income of ten per cent was promised.[3] The effort at this time went so far as to invite publicly proposals for the erection of the building.[4] It is probable further progress was checked by sectional jealousy, for a few months later a city ordinance was passed to fit up the market house on East Capitol Street as a court-house "for the temporary accommodation of the circuit and supreme courts." This law was not carried out, and the court continued in the capitol building, where it shared with the Supreme Court the use of a room which was described as "little better than a dungeon." [5] However, as the writer of the newspaper communication using this phrase urged that the citizens of the western portion of the city and of Georgetown unite in a site for a court-house between the patent office and Georgetown, it might be concluded he did not have an unbiassed mind. In the meantime the work on the capitol had made such progress that in February, 1819 the Supreme Court held for the first time its annual term in the room which continued to be its home for so many years and where its library is now housed.[1] There, too, the circuit court held the following June term, which proved to be its last sitting in the capitol building. Some time before the date of the term of the local court it is probable notice was served that its room was more desired than its company. While that was a sufficient reason to make other provision, there was also the additional consideration of the growing public inconvenience of a Capitol Hill location of the court-room. At any rate a revival of the city hall agitation occurred in the summer of 1819. The advocates of a Capitol Hill site favored the purchase of the Brick Capitol,[2] while that was opposed on the part of those who favored Judiciary Square. Then the city council provided for the appointment of a committee to determine upon a plan for a city hall building, and also to ask the president of the United States for the use of ground as a site on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 2d St. and John Marshall Place.[3] A few months later the two houses met in the restored wings of the capitol, and the furniture left in the Brick Capitol was offered for sale.[4] But when the circuit court, in spite of the warning, met in the Supreme Court room, the time and place fixed upon, the court was told, not that it was not wanted, but that the rooms occupied by the clerk and the marshal were needed by the senate for committee rooms.[5] So the court adjourned until suitable accommodations could be secured. The homeless state of the court was brought to the attention of congress and gave rise in the house to a thoroughly typical discussion of District affairs.[6] From the speaker of the house, Henry Clay, came the expression of a doubt whether such accommodations ought to be provided at public expense. For $800, the proposed annual rental for the Brick Capitol, he said the fee simple of many of the county court-houses in some of the states could be

---

[1] Latrobe's report, Feb. 14, 1817. American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, pp. 426 and 511; also *Intelligencer*, June 28, 1817.

[2] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 529, Nov. 27, 1818.

[3] Stats., 3, 324, April 29, 1816.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 15, 1816. In this temporary room the following annual February term of the United States Supreme Court was held. The same, Feb. 6, 1817.

---

[1] The sum of $3634 was spent on this modest prototype of the spacious piles that now flank the capitol building on the east. As it turned out, it was of more than temporary use, as it continued to be the office building of congress for seven years or until the central portion of the capitol was built and the space apportioned between the two houses and rooms assigned for the use of committees. Annals of Congress, May 21, 1824, pp. 2682 and 2708.

[2] *Intelligencer*, July 16, 1816.

[3] The same, July 18, 1816.

[4] The same, July 23, 1816.

[5] The same, Feb. 6, 1818.

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 2, 1819.

[2] The same, June 17, 1819.

[3] The same, July 8, 1819.

[4] The same, Dec. 6, 1819.

[5] The same.

[6] Annals of Congress, Dec. 23, 1819, p. 781.

purchased. Thomas W. Cobb of Georgia favored levying a tax on the citizens for the purpose of erecting a building, while another speaker, overlooking the federal character of the court, said the county of Washington had no more right to expect the United States to pay the expense of holding its court than any other county in any state in the Union. This view was emphasized by another member who declared, "Here you have all around you displayed the pride and splendor of wealth by the inhabitants of the District and I will not for one moment consent to extract from the pockets of the hardy yeomanry of the country the means of supporting institutions intended exclusively for their use and benefit."[1] However, those who voted outnumbered those who talked, and thus it happened that the discussion did not forecast the vote, as an appropriation was made for the lease of the Brick Capitol, and there the postponed session of the circuit court was held and in the same building were provided also rooms for the clerk of the court and the marshal.[2]

Year after year the supply of money for the improvement of the capitol grounds was continued, so that nine years after a beginning was made, a visitor to the city said he had seen many cities, but not one "whose site is more picturesque and beautiful." He was impressed with the promise of the beauty of Capitol Square. "And even now," he added, "it is a delightful resort."[3] He expressed surprise, as visitors have continued to do ever since, "to find so few private houses in the immediate neighborhood of this beautiful square. I had supposed the streets on both sides would have been built up with edifices before this, and that instead of being appropriated to boarding houses, the few that have been erected would have been occupied by gentlemen of fortune and persons not in business."

The capitol grounds then and for the next twelve years, until extended on the west to 1st Street,[4] were a comparatively restricted area. A circular roadway some distance east from

---

[1] Annals of Congress, Dec. 23, 1819, p. 783.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 4, 1820.

[3] The same, June 13, 1825.

[4] Stats., 5, 114, July 4, 1836. *Intelligencer*, Jan. 13, 1837.

1st Street followed the enclosing fence of iron and stone, and although entirely within the public grounds, yet the funds of the city were expended in completing it.[1]

The early attention paid to the surroundings of the capitol building, it may be presumed, was not entirely to please the taste and gratify the eyes of members of congress. For during the sessions many visitors came to the city, and it was then fashionable to go to the capitol to hear the debates. The new senate chamber, as was the case with the old, had a gallery where men alone went, the ladies being accommodated with seats on the floor, where also foreign ministers and distinguished strangers were seated. In the course of a few years this practice was found to interfere with the business of the senate, and in 1829 another gallery was built, but of such limited capacity that the expected relief was not gained and the ladies were admitted to the floor as usual. In the house, where the gallery room was more spacious, spectators were not admitted to the floor except under the rules of the house regulating the matter, and also by custom in the last days of a session.

The change in the size of the hall brought about a change in the rules, for just prior to returning to the capitol building and while still in the Brick Capitol it was the custom to seat on the floor of the house, not alone the foreign ministers, but also men and women who had come to hear the debates. In this way the seating capacity of the gallery was supplemented. In January, 1819, during the delivery of one of Henry Clay's great speeches, it is recorded, the ladies in the galleries, inaccessible on account of the great throng, were supplied with oranges by their friends on the floor who fastened the fruit on a long pole.[2] The Supreme Court was also a place of interest on occasions, while the new room of the library of congress, "the most splendid place of anything of that nature in the United States," [3] was a fashionable resort.

---

[1] City Ordinance, Nov. 3, 1823.

[2] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 146.

[3] Description of the Etiquette at Washington City, p. 53. See also History of the Library, p. 129.

The opening of what was described by Edward Everett, one of the most cultivated men of the time, as a beautiful room provided what had been a lack in the new city, a general meeting-place for acquaintances. The entire west front of the centre building, fitted up in a style of unusual elegance and dignity, provided the place, and the books and pictures were an excuse for the meeting there of persons of both sexes.[1] Even before the more commodious quarters became available in the year 1824, and while the library was in a suite of rooms on the west side of the north wing on the same floor as the gallery of the senate, it had become a resort. During the three years the books were kept in the post-office building the distance from the capitol as well as the cramped quarters kept the library in the background. Then as the north wing neared completion and in the summer of 1818 the library of congress was again back in the capitol building.[2] In the rotunda, before the walls had fairly dried, were placed four paintings commemorative of events in the American Revolution, which congress in 1816 had authorized the president to employ John Trumbull of Connecticut to execute. The great apartment was without heat, and besides exposing the paintings to the changes of temperature, there was no provision, not even a railing, much less attendants, to prevent inquiring minds from investigating with sticks whether the pictures were painted on the wall.[3] These "shin-bone" canvasses, as they were derisively termed in the course of debate in the house, suggested by the display of ankles in the group of men wearing smallclothes, were ordered directly by congress, a practice which continued down to recent times.

The earliest governmental art commission assembled in the unfurnished East Room of the White House in the spring of 1825. Appointed at the suggestion of President Adams as persons of taste and skill, they were asked to determine from among the models and designs submitted for the tympanum of the central east entrance of the capitol building the one that had the most merit. After examination it was decided that none of them was entitled to the award. A new design, suggested by the president, was made by Mr. Persico and carved on stone.[1] What proved to be still more disquieting, to at least some of the members of congress, than the bad housing of the rotunda paintings, was the discovery that this great section of the building was a sort of twilight zone, a no man's land, where there was no recognized authority. The officers of the two houses while jointly exercising a general authority yet could not include it within the range of their police duties apparently because of lack of a sufficient force.[2] The slight police protection for the interior of the building was duplicated in the night guard for the capitol grounds, provided as early as 1825 and consisting of two men, one on the east front and one on the west front in command of a sergeant,[3] the first night police in the District west of Rock Creek. In the central portion of the building, as was stated on the floor of the house, there were nuisances, some of them of such a nature as to be revolting to the moral sense. The rotunda was considered "the common property of every person who chose to occupy it." [4] As soon as it was available for use, an exhibition of the panorama of Paris was opened there, for which the proprietor made a charge of fifty cents. Then the place was changed into a great exhibition hall for domestic manufactures. But in addition, "triangles of steel to take the place of bells, stoves, stew pans, pianos, mouse traps and watch ribbons were marked with prices and sundry good bargains were driven." [5] As explained by Mr. Forsyth in the house, the officers of the two houses, having no authority to permit it to be used, did not forbid, and the consequence was that "any one who has a picture to sell hangs it on the walls. If one has a model of a machine to show, it is spread out on the floor or set in motion."

---

[1] History of Library of Congress, p. 186.

[2] While the official name was restrictive, yet the conception of the collection as a national library was suggested on the title-page of the catalogue issued in 1815, a few months after the Jefferson books had been purchased. History of Library of Congress, p. 138.

[3] Annals of Congress, Feb. 23, 1827, p. 1364.

---

[1] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 6, p. 533. The commission consisted of Dr. William Thornton and C. B. King, artist, who were selected by the president and Colonel George Bomford, U. S. A. named by Mr. Bulfinch, the architect of the capitol.

[2] Annals of Congress, May 21, 1824, p. 2575.

[3] History of the Library of Congress, p. 132.

[4] Speech of John Forsyth of Georgia in the House, Feb. 23, 1827. Annals of Congress, p. 1367.

[5] The same.

Directly in the centre of the floor was an opening that had the appearance of a well, as an observer remarked,[1] but which was planned when it was thought the body of General Washington would be placed in the crypt below. When congress in 1828 authorized the presiding officers of the two houses to make regulations for the care and police of the capitol, but little change was made in the uses of the rotunda. For ten years later it was declared that there may be seen a collection "of pictures and butter churns, cannons and busts, basso relievos and statues promiscuously blended." [2] Apparently in accordance with the clause in the law of May 2, 1828, that authorized the extension of the police regulations of the city to the capitol and the grounds, when requested by the presiding officer of either house or by the commissioner of public buildings, a city ordinance was passed the following year which made disorderly conduct, injury of property and like offences at the capitol and within its grounds punishable as if committed in any part of the city. It was not alone the rotunda that was found to be convenient for general use, but also in the evening the hall of the house. If there was to be a meeting of any sort under auspices that could secure a note to the speaker from one of the members, the house was lighted and made ready. Ten years after the new chamber was first occupied an effort was made to put a stop to this practice. The gatherings held there, as was stated on the floor of the house, were for all sorts of purposes, and besides the cost of lighting was not less than $100 an evening.[3] No action was taken at that time, but the tendency to restrict such privileges was manifest, as some months previously the use of the hall of

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 8, 1825.

[2] Register of Debates, June, 1838, p. 421.

[3] Annals of Congress, March 1, 1828, p. 1699.

the house for a Fourth of July celebration was refused on the ground that rules had been made that the hall should no longer be used for that purpose.[1] It was in the rotunda that it was proposed to give a ball to General Lafayette on the occasion of his visit in the fall of 1824 as the guest of the city. However, a dinner at the Franklin House was substituted for the ball, and the rotunda was not used except on the day of his arrival, when he was officially received there and greeted by Roger C. Weightman, the mayor of the city.

As recalling the old-time custom of members of the house wearing their hats during the sessions, it is recorded that when General Lafayette entered the house, "the members and persons admitted on the floor rose and remained standing, uncovered." [2] This custom was observed by the spectators in the gallery.[3]

At the time of General Lafayette's visit, President Monroe was then within a few months of the close of his second term. The distinguished visitor, who was received with universal evidences of esteem and affection on the part of the people of the country, would no doubt have been entertained at the White House, only he was the guest of the city of Washington.[4] He stayed at the Franklin House on the occasion of his first visit, returning to the city again when congress was in session and also the following summer.[5]

At that time the restored or rather rebuilt White House had been occupied as the official home of the president for eight years. For after the fire a large part of the outer walls were found in such a condition that they were taken down and rebuilt. The work was done under the direction of James Hoban, the author of the original design.[1] He had continued to live in the city after his public service ended, and at that time had been a resident for some twenty-three years. At an early period he became a property owner, served as a member of the city council, but with the exception of his service with the government does not seem to have practised his profession. After he furnished the drawings for the Blodgett Hotel, which was the only structure in the city other than the White House and the two department buildings of 1819 that he is known to have designed, there is no record of any further professional work. When he entered upon his second term of service in 1815, he was fifty-three years of age, a year younger than Dr. Thornton and two years older than Latrobe, both of whom left a number of examples of their taste and skill in designing buildings in the city. In a little less than two years and a half after Mr. Hoban was placed in charge, the White House was sufficiently completed so that President Monroe occupied it on his return, in September, 1817, from a three months' tour through the eastern and western sections of the country.[2] During the two months and more in the previous spring between his inauguration and leaving the city, the president continued to occupy the residence where he had lived as secretary of state. As a portion of the furniture ordered for the White House was not ready Mr. Monroe made use of his own. But as the woodwork of the house was freshly painted and the plastering hardly dry, apprehensive of the effect upon his health, the president hastened away to his house in Loudoun County, Va., where his wife and daughters were.[3] In truth the house was in an incomplete state. The floor in the east room had not been laid or the walls plastered. The range of domestic offices on the east and west were still to be restored. There was no stable provided until the following year. However, some of the rooms in the house had been furnished and the windows hung with silk and damask curtains, while chairs, ornamental clocks and a piano, all the result of the handiwork of French looms and artisans, served to make attractive the interior. The furniture, it was explained, was made or was being made in Washington, but other items in the furnishing were bought in France because they could not be procured in this country.[1] All this information was in reply to a newspaper critic who objected to the White House being filled with foreign-made goods. As the money appropriated for this purpose was spent under the direction of the president, this criticism was in the nature of a personal attack upon the new occupant of the White House. Soon, however, there was another cause of complaint, which for the time kept the social world of the day in a ferment. For Mrs. Monroe soon made it evident that the easy-going reign of the gracious and vivacious Dolly Madison was over, as it became known that she had adopted the rule of not making first calls or of returning calls. Not only had the president's wife been expected to make calls on the wives of officials and members of congress, but also on all strangers who came to the city. "A torture," as Mr. Adams characterizes it, which Mrs. Madison submitted to, as having begun the practice she did not see her way to abandon it.[2] Mrs. Monroe had the disadvantage, in inaugurating this reform, of being little known in Washington society, although she had lived in the city for seven years prior to her husband's election. Owing probably to ill health she had gone out but little and was a comparative stranger.[3] While there was complaint and actual resentment on the part of many of those who had been accustomed to a different state of affairs, yet it came to be recognized "that owing to the increase in the population of the District the task of the president's wife returning all the calls was such an onerous one, as to make it practically impossible."[1] It took some time, however, to reconcile Washington society to the change, and even in the third season the drawing-rooms were but slimly attended.[2] At the same time when Mrs. Monroe heard complaints that Mrs. Adams, the wife of the secretary of state, was not observing the custom of making first calls on all strangers, she spoke to her about it and urged her to conform.[3] Mrs. Adams very frankly said that she did not intend to make first calls, but did intend to return calls. The reform thus inaugurated succeeded and as the years went on was broadened in its scope, so that in the course of a little over a decade the custom was for strangers not only to make first calls on the heads of departments, but also on members of congress. In addition it was recognized that members of congress were not obliged to return calls made by entire strangers.[4]

---

[1] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 7, pp. 300 and 302, July 2, 1827.

[2] Annals of Congress, Dec. 9, 1824, p. 3.

[3] Description of the etiquette at Washington City, p. 50. E. Cooley, M.D., Philadelphia, 1830. In the senate the members and the spectators removed their hats. The same, p. 43.

[4] Of a total expenditure for the year 1824–1825 of $33,932, the city spent on the entertainment of General Lafayette $2700, $900 more than was expended on the public schools, and the largest single appropriation of the year. Rothwell's Digest, p. 300.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 2, 1824; also Aug. 12, 1825. See also Adams Memoirs, Vol. 7, pp. 39 and 40.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 28, 1815. Notice of his appointment by the commission.

[2] The same, June 3 and Sept. 18, 1817. Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 7.

[3] The place was known as Oak Hill and was near Aldie, and about ten miles south of Leesburg and thirty-three miles from Washington. (Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 117.) It was there the president spent the summers during his term as president.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 29, 1817.

[3] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 45.

[3] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 141.

While the social usages were thus changing to suit the conditions of a larger centre, yet after all the Washington circle of society was a small one. For when on Wednesday evening of every other week during the season the White House was thrown open to the public for the evening receptions of the president's wife, refreshments were served. Servants carrying waiters passed through the rooms, and those present helped themselves to coffee, tea, cakes, jellies, ice-cream, wine, sometimes cordials and other liquor and foreign fruit. In the earlier days this was an agreeable hospitality, but when the guests increased in number so as to throng the rooms, it was difficult for the waiters to make their way about, so that it is quite evident this custom was continued after it was no longer suitable.[5]

Mrs. Monroe's drawing-room, the first social event in the reconstructed White House, was held on the first Wednesday evening in December, 1817. It is quite evident that Mr. Monroe was the real leader in the changes in social practice. As the time approached for the New Year's reception, he consulted his cabinet about the procedure, and it was then decided that the members of the diplomatic corps would be received at eleven-thirty, to be followed by a reception to the general public from 12 to 3 o'clock.[1] Up to that time, apparently, the members of the diplomatic corps had no fixed place in this annual reception. Mrs. Seaton notes that on New Year's day in 1814, after having made her entrance into the White House with great difficulty owing to the crowd and having paid her respects to the president and Mrs. Madison and eaten some ice-cream and drunk a glass of Madeira, she was leaving the rooms when her attention was attracted through the window to what she thought "to be a rolling ball of burnished gold carried with swiftness through the air by two gilt wings. Our anxiety increased the nearer it approached, until it actually stopped before the door, and from it alighted, weighted with gold lace, the French minister (M. Serurier) and suite. We now also perceived that what we thought were wings were nothing more than gorgeous footmen with chapeaux, gilt-braided skirts and splendid swords. Nothing ever was witnessed in Washington so brilliant and dazzling."[2] When the president received an invitation to attend a ball given by de Neuville, the French minister, he consulted Major Jackson, who had been Washington's private secretary. He was told that Major Jackson never heard of any president being at the house of a foreign minister.[3] Mr. Monroe concluded to adhere to the custom, and Mrs. Monroe, deciding she would not go where it was not proper for her husband to go, also declined the invitation. The weak state of her health kept Mrs. Monroe from being very active in society. She was represented by her daughter, Mrs. George Hay, who lived at the White House, as did also the president's secretary, Joseph Jones Monroe, who was his brother, and Samuel L. Gouveneur, Mrs. Monroe's nephew.[1] Mrs. Hay, as representing Mrs. Monroe, also refused to make first visits. The wives of the foreign ministers resented this change, and as the ladies of the White House did not call on them they did not visit at the White House. At the same time the freedom of intercourse with the chief executive which had been enjoyed by their husbands during the administrations of Jefferson and Madison, when they were at liberty to drop in on the president in a social way, was ended. The president made it known he would see foreign ministers only at private audiences when requested by them, at the drawing-rooms and at diplomatic dinners once or twice a week.[2] At that time the diplomatic corps had seven members with the rank of minister.[3] But only the ministers from England and France, for almost the first twenty years of Washington as the capital, had their homes in the city.[4]

---

[1] *City of Washington Gazette*, Dec. 17, 1817.

[2] William Winston Seaton, December, 1819, p. 144.

[3] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 45.

[4] A Description of the Etiquette of Washington City, 1830, pp. 33 and 41. The first book published descriptive of the etiquette at the nation's capital.

[5] Etiquette at Washington, p. 9.

---

[1] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 32, Dec. 30, 1817.

[2] William Winston Seaton, p. 114.

[3] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 188, Dec. 10, 1818.

Both the English and the French ministers made use of their establishments, extensive for that time, in a social way, and Madame de Neuville's weekly teas and Mr. Bagot's dinners and receptions were prominent events in the social register of the time.[5] Another member of the diplomatic corps who figured in Washington society from 1816 to 1822, although only spending a part of each season there, was José Correa de Serra, minister from Portugal, generally known as the Abbé Correa, a man of scientific and literary interests and a bright and witty conversationalist. To him is attributed the descriptive phrase of Washington as "the city of magnificent distances."

---

[1] The latter became the president's secretary about the year 1818, and on March 9, 1820, was married in the White House to Marie Hester Monroe, the president's youngest daughter. Adams Memoirs, Vol. 5, p. 15.

[2] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 295.

[3] The same, Nov. 30, 1816. The countries represented were England, France, Spain, Sweden, Denmark, Portugal and Russia.

[4] *Intelligencer*, June 18, 1817. The Washington directory of 1822 gives in addition to the above the names of the ministers from Mexico and Sweden as having residences in the city.

[5] When the announcement was made that these diplomats were to end their service in this country, members of congress and citizens joined in a movement to give to each a ball. *Intelligencer*, May 26, 1819.

The usage observed by the president as to accepting social invitations was a general one and was not confined merely to members of the diplomatic corps. How closely he adhered to it is evident from his course near the close of his second term, when he declined to attend a ball given by Mr. Adams, his secretary of state, at his residence on the anniversary of the victory of New Orleans, when General Jackson, the hero of that event, was present. The president gave as a reason that he did not think it wise to depart from his rule of not visiting at private houses.[1] The following fall of 1824, when W. W. Seaton entertained General Lafayette at an evening reception at his residence on the south side of E Street between 7th and 8th streets, northwest, the president was not asked, which indicates what was probably the general custom. The company entertained on that occasion numbered three hundred and sixty, and how that was accomplished in a house of a size common to that period is explained by Mrs. Seaton, who states that her bedchamber and nursery were used as card and supper rooms, while dancing went on in the dining and drawing rooms.[2] As the theatre was not open in the winter season except for occasional performances until after the year 1830, that source of amusement did not enter the social life of the city. The earliest record of a president attending a theatrical performance states that President Monroe and his family in 1819 attended a performance at the Washington Theatre, which had been open in the summer each season since 1804, with the exception of one year. In spite of limitations the theatre had its place in the life of the community. After the building was destroyed by fire in the spring of 1820, a more commodious structure, seating about 700 persons, was completed in the year 1821. The location, also a new one, was on the south side of Louisiana Avenue between John Marshall Place and 6th Street, northwest. This building was also called the Washington Theatre.[1] During the Monroe term another series of questions involving form and procedure arose on the occasion of the death in Washington, after a service of six years, of Frederick Greuhm, the first minister from Prussia. For the first time since the government had been established a foreign minister had died at the capital city. The question as to what should be the course of the government was settled by the president deciding to send his carriage to the funeral, while the cabinet officers attended in person. The conclusion was reached that no action on the part of the two houses of congress was necessary, and when the funeral services were held in the Presbyterian Church on F Street, only two members of that body were present. On account of the weather, as a heavy rain fell, the order directing the Marine Corps to act as escort was countermanded.[2] The question also arose whether, in accordance with the custom in Europe, a cushion should be carried preceding the hearse, on which was to be placed the cross of the order of which the deceased was a member. But when it was pointed out that the spectators, unfamiliar with the custom, might take them for Masonic emblems, it was concluded to omit that detail.

---

[1] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 6, p. 229, Jan. 8, 1824. In Vol. 7, p. 39, under date of Aug. 1, 1825, Mr. Adams, then president, records that he declined an invitation to a party given at a private house in honor of General Lafayette, "following," he adds, "the example of all my predecessors, none of whom ever attended at private parties."

[2] William Winston Seaton, p. 170.

Somewhat of a stir was caused by the marriage of Baron Gruehm a few years after his arrival in this country. His wife, who was pretty and attractive, had been a governess in the family of Henry Middleton, member of the house from South Carolina, who was appointed in 1820 minister to Russia. During his service in the house Mr. Middleton occupied the residence at Kalorama which had been left vacant by the death of Mrs. Barlow in 1819.[3] To this house, where a short time before she had lived as an employé, she came as its mistress, the wife of Baron Greuhm. The members of the diplomatic corps were inclined to look upon the match as a social blunder, but concluded to overlook the circumstance that the bride had once earned her own living, and the social relations were not disturbed.[1] The changes made or attempted to be made in the social usages and rules did not all emanate from the White House. At that time the senate came to the conclusion to give that body a social status that would be distinct, and so the members agreed that they would pay the first visit to no one but the president.[2] In other words, the members of the cabinet must hasten out to call on the senators as they arrived in town. This action was looked upon as important enough to be considered at a meeting of the cabinet, but no result was reached beyond stirring up the talk of the day. The degree of interest displayed in social matters has a further evidence in the lengthening of the season. Before the war the cycle of dinners and balls was completed in six weeks, but at this period it was continued through ten weeks, beginning with the drawing-room at the president's house the first Wednesday evening of December[3] and ending with the last in the middle of February.[4] A round of festivities was planned the season of 1820 in honor of the newly married daughter of President Monroe. First of all, the doors of the hospitable home of Commodore Decatur were opened and a splendid ball was given. But in the course of a few days the doors were again opened to admit the mortally wounded body of the master of the house, who had fallen in a duel fought with Commodore Barron on that field at Bladensburg which had early received its baptism of blood. The town was stunned by the news, and the brilliant plans for the further festivities in honor of the White House bride were abandoned.[1] Hardly a year had passed since, on the same field at Bladensburg, Armistead Thompson Mason, formerly an honored senator from the state of Virginia, was killed by his cousin, John M. McCarty, in a duel fought with muskets at six paces. Both men lived near Leesburg, Va., and were well known in the District.[2] So profound was the feeling aroused that an attempt was made in the senate to pass a resolution providing for the punishment of officers of the army and navy connected with the affair. Beyond instructing a committee to inquire into the expediency of providing by law for the punishment of all persons concerned in duelling in the District, nothing was done.[3] Then when the Decatur tragedy occurred, John Randolph of Virginia, who some four years later showed his belief in the code by facing Henry Clay in what proved to be a bloodless duel in a field a short distance from the Chain Bridge, wanted the house to adjourn to attend the Decatur funeral.[4] This the house refused to do and took no further action, which led John Quincy Adams to notice in his journal that "this feeble and negative censure upon the practice of duelling is all that can be obtained from congress."[5] A resolution, adopted by the house, declared that existing laws, if executed, were ample to prevent duelling in the army, which apparently was a reference to the army order of 1814 imposing a penalty of dismissal for such an offence.[6] It is quite evident that public sentiment was not behind the law or orders aimed at this practice, and it was not until nearly twenty years after Decatur's death that a law prohibiting duelling in the District was passed by congress.[1]

---

[1] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 5, p. 76. Early Washington Theatres. A. I. Mudd.

[2] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 6, p. 222, Dec. 1, 1823.

[3] *Intelligencer*, June 20, 1820. Notice of the sale of the Middleton furniture at Kalorama.

---

[1] William Winston Seaton, p. 145.

[2] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 488, Dec. 21, 1819.

[3] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 130.

[4] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 260. The season's program, as outlined by a correspondent in the *New York Commercial Advertiser* and reprinted in the *City of Washington Gazette*, Feb. 12, 1818, included two dinners a week by the president, the drawing-room of the president's wife once in two weeks, a teaparty every Saturday evening by Madame de Neuville, the French minister's wife, and a dinner once a week by the speaker of the house, which the writer noted costs $100.

---

[1] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 5, p. 31, March 22, 1820. William Winston Seaton, p. 148. Miss Monroe was the first daughter of a president to be married in the White House.

[2] *City of Washington Gazette*, Feb. 6, 1819. Also Adams Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 246.

[3] Annals of Congress, Feb. 8, 1819, p. 212.

[4] The same, March 23, 1820, pp. 1670 and 1675.

[5] Vol. 5, p. 36.

[6] *Intelligencer*, May 26, 1814; also *Niles' Weekly Register*.

---

[1] Stats., 5, 318, Feb. 20, 1839. A list of the duels fought at Bladensburg is taken from an article published in the *Evening Star* of May 4, 1896. 1802: Representative Barent Gardenier of New York and Representative George Washington Campbell of Tennessee, the former wounded but not fatally. May 26, 1814: Ensign Edward Hopkins, 36th Infantry, was killed in duel. Then came the Mason-McCarty duel and the Decatur-Barron duel. Aug. 7, 1821: Randall killed Edward Fox, both clerks in the treasury department. 1822: Gibson, a clerk in the treasury department, shot but not fatally Midshipman Samuel B. Cooke, U. S. N. In 1836, Representative Daniel Jenifer of Maryland and Jesse A. Bynum of North Carolina had a bloodless duel. In 1847, Robert Williams and David Bell, ensigns in the naval academy, exchanged shots without damage. In 1852, J. M. Daniel and E. W. Johnson, two Virginia editors, exchanged shots without injury, and the following year Robert Ridgway, a Virginia editor, and S. G. Davis of the same state had a similar encounter. H. A. Wise, member of the house from Virginia, and Richard Coke, a former member from the same district, fought at Bladensburg, Jan. 22, 1835, resulting in Coke's being wounded. Adams Memoirs, Vol. 9, p. 200.

CHAPTER III

PROPOSED INAUGURAL CHANGE

The four years of Monroe's first term passed without material change in the building and grounds of the White House. A stone wall was built on each side of the main entrance, at a distance of the width of the house, extending to the street.[1] Some attention was paid to the levelling and improvement of the grounds.[2] But the two fronts were still without the porticos and the east room had not been finished when Mr. Monroe took the oath of office for the second term in March, 1821.

As the 4th of March, for the first time since the formation of the government, fell on Sunday the question arose when the oath should be administered. Chief Justice Marshall advised that it be deferred until Monday,[3] and as this course was followed the country was without a president for a day, or from Sunday noon to Monday noon. That matter out of the way, it was proposed that the custom of delivering an inaugural address be given up, for, as was maintained by some of the president's Virginia friends, it was anti-republican and not authorized by the constitution.[4] Four days before the inauguration, and it may be presumed the speech had been written, the cabinet considered the proposed innovation and decided against it. After having successfully passed these two obstacles a more formidable one was apparently avoided by the exercise of tact. Four years before, the senate committee in charge of the inaugural ceremonies met with an unexpected rebuff from the house or rather the speaker. Profiting from that experience, the senate did not reassert its claim to the right to the control of the house chamber for that occasion by appointing the usual committee of arrangements. Instead the custody of the house chamber was intrusted to the marshal of the District, Tench Ringgold, and the clerk of the house. The marshal was a personal friend of the president, having served with him when he was acting as secretary of war after the destruction of the city.[1] He was therefore no doubt selected as the representative of the president, and his services on that occasion mark the beginning of the practice, which continued at intervals down to quite recent days, of using the marshal of the District as an aide to the chief magistrate.

---

[1] The section of street in front of the White House between 15th and 17th streets was commonly spoken of as Pennsylvania Avenue as early as 1825. (The Sessford Annals, January, 1825. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 276.) In the city ordinances of July 17 and Oct. 7, 1824, providing for the improvement of this section, it is described as the street north of the president's house.

[2] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 578.

[3] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 5, p. 312.

[4] The same, p. 292.

In some particulars the functions of the marshal at that period were similar to those of a sheriff. Besides having charge of the jail and of executions, he was expected at times to exercise police powers in preserving peace and order. He and his deputies were used in maintaining order at public functions in and about the White House, and when necessary, regulating admission to receptions and keeping the coachmen in order.[2] He was required by law to attend the sessions of the Supreme Court, and from the beginning of the meeting of that court in Washington down to the year 1867, when the office of marshal for the Supreme Court was created, the successive incumbents of the office of the marshal of the District performed that service.

No innovations in the inaugural program were made. It was proposed, as had been done four years before, to have a civilian mounted escort to accompany the president from his residence to the capitol.[3] But during the preceding night there was a heavy fall of snow and rain, and the streets the next day were not in condition for an out-of-door display, which may account for the fact that when the president and the members of his cabinet left the White House that morning, only the marshal and one of his deputies were present to act as an escort.[1] Attired in a full suit of black broadcloth "of some what antiquated fashion," Adams notes, with shoe and knee buckles, the president stepped into a carriage drawn by four horses. The four members of the cabinet followed, each in a carriage and pair. The little procession passed down Pennsylvania Avenue, which was almost deserted, but when the capitol building was reached, there was such a throng that it was with difficulty the president was able to enter the hall. The British minister, Sir Stratford Canning, and the secretary of legation, G. C. Antrobus, in full court dress, were unable to get in, while it was only after much crowding and pressure that the cabinet ministers succeeded.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 14, 1831.

[2] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 7, pp. 199 and 295. First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 183.

[3] *Intelligencer*, March 3, 1821.

It was estimated that the president faced an audience of at least 2100 persons crowded in the hall of the house when he arose to take the oath of office, after which he delivered the inaugural. A new feature was the introduction of music in the simple ceremony. The Marine Band played while the president entered the chamber and then again upon the completion of the address. After the proceedings at the capitol, a reception was held at the White House, and in the evening a ball at the Indian Queen or Brown's Hotel, when a supper was served, for which the president did not stay.[2] The secretary of state, Mr. Adams, attended the ball, and he records that with Mrs. Adams he got home about midnight. At that time he had given up the house at the corner of 6th and C streets, northwest, which he had leased from Daniel Brent, the chief clerk of the state department, when he came to the city four years before to begin his service in the president's cabinet.[1] He was then living in the three-story brick house on the site of the Adams Building, 1333–1335 F Street, northwest,[2] which had just been given up by Richard Cutts, who then moved into his new residence at H Street and Madison Place. The title to the property was transferred to Mr. Adams a few months later.[3] Here he made his home until he went four years later to the White House.[4]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 6, 1821; Adams Memoirs, Vol. 5, p. 319.

[2] The ball on that occasion appears to have been due to the enterprise of Mr. Brown, judging from the notice given in the *Intelligencer* of Feb. 28, 1821, under the heading "Inauguration Ball." "A ball will be given at Brown's on the evening of March 5th in honor of the occasion of the inauguration of James Monroe as president. . . .

"Those gentlemen who propose to attend this ball are respectfully invited by Mr. Brown to meet at his hotel for the purpose of choosing managers and making other necessary arrangements."

A few months before the inaugural ball the lease of the hotel where it was held had been given up by John Davis, who was succeeded by Jesse Brown, for several years the proprietor of the City Hotel in Alexandria.[5] At that time a rival in business of the Indian Queen Hotel was the Mansion Hotel, John Strother, proprietor, at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street.[6]

In the same square to the west was the Washington Hotel under the management of Joshua Tennison,[7] while the Fountain

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 24, 1817, and Oct. 25, 1821.

[2] Memoirs, Vol. 5, p. 262.

[3] Liber A, Z, ff. 437 and 439, May 14, 1821.

[4] It is probable during this period an addition was built on the east portion of the lot, so that the dwelling occupied the entire frontage of fifty feet. For on the anniversary of the battle of New Orleans, Jan. 8, 1824, Mr. Adams gave a ball in celebration of that event, which General Jackson and a company of about 1000 attended. Adams Memoirs. Vol. 6, p. 229.

[5] *Intelligencer*, May 21, 1817. Same, July 29 and Nov. 7, 1820.

[6] In 1824 Basil Williamson succeeded Strother, and it was known as Williamson's Mansion House. (*Intelligencer*, April 29, 1824.) The latter was succeeded by Frederick Barnard. (*Intelligencer*, Dec. 23, 1828.) By 1833 Azariah Fuller was the proprietor, and the name had been changed from Mansion House to the American House.

[7] Tennison was the proprietor for about ten years, with an interval of some two years, when Alexander Sanford had the hotel. (*Intelligencer*, Oct. 9, 1822.) At the close of Tennison's second term of service (*Intelligencer*, Dec. 24, 1827) the place was under the management of William S. Williamson and was known as the City Hotel. Three years later John Strother, the former proprietor of the Mansion House, was the manager. (*Intelligencer*, Oct. 14, 1830.)

Inn, a small building at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 12th Street, David Appler, proprietor, was hardly a factor in the business.

The only hotel of that period of any pretensions on Capitol Hill was the old-time house in the centre of Carroll Row that about a year after peace had been declared had been opened by Nicholas L. Queen. In the course of ten years he gave up this location for one on Louisiana Avenue near the market and that closed the history of Carroll Row in the hotel business.[1]

After this the Capitol Hill hotels did not figure prominently. At the opposite extreme from the centre of the city was the Union Hotel of Georgetown, then in the decline of its career.[2] Another outlying hotel, the Franklin House, at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 21st Street, was in difficulties at this period, not entirely due to the location, but to the financial straits of the owner, William O'Neale, who had been for many years the manager.[3] At this crisis in his affairs the genial Irishman found a friend in General John H. Eaton, who was then completing his first term as a senator from Tennessee. He made his home at the hotel, and when at this time Eaton's warm personal friend, Andrew Jackson, came to the senate from Tennessee, he also lived at the Franklin Hotel.[4] There also lived Mrs. Margaret Timberlake, the daughter of the landlord, who some seven years before, when a young girl, had married a paymaster in the navy.[5]

Senator Eaton bought all the real estate holdings of O'Neale to prevent them from being sacrificed.[1] This circumstance as well as his acquaintance with the attractive, vivacious and somewhat unconventional Peggy, as she was known, was no doubt the subject of current gossip at the time. But it was revived with full force, and as such things go with doubtless many additional details, some six years later, and a few months after the news had been received of the suicide of Timberlake while at sea, when the widow was married to Eaton.[2] Before the honeymoon had hardly ended the bridegroom resigned from the senate to become secretary of war in the cabinet of Andrew Jackson.[3] General Eaton held the O'Neale hotel property only about a year, when it was purchased by John Gadsby, the former proprietor of the Indian Queen Hotel in Baltimore, later known as Barnum's.[4] For twenty years there had been no change in the number of hotels, except the closing of those on Capitol Hill with no successors, or in the size of the buildings. Then in 1827 the National Hotel was built by the Calvert estate at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th Street that was notable not alone for its size, but as being the first building erected in the city for such a purpose that was not designed along the same lines as a private house. It was leased to John Gadsby, who closed the Franklin Hotel and turned the building into a row of houses.[5] The coming of this new competitor aroused two of the other hotel owners. At once Jesse Brown, who had purchased the Indian Queen property, enlarged the building, making it four stories in height in the central part, and in that respect it equalled its new neighbor, and also extended it back to C Street, which was also what was done in the case of the National, only with the latter the square was deeper.[6] Then the Tayloe estate enlarged the Mansion House at Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street so that it had 100 instead of 40 rooms[1]; but that, however, came nearer to the 200 rooms which the National boasted about.[2] Mr. Brown was also confident, as Mr. Gadsby was, that his hotel was "if not the largest in the United States is nearly so."[3] After the period of activity beginning in 1827, no further change was made in the hotel accommodations until the half of the century had nearly come to an end. Although during this time the city was growing in population as well as a national centre, still public men as well as visitors to the city showed the old-time preference for boarding-house life. One observer of Washington life in 1829 states that it was then becoming quite common for members of congress to take their families to Washington. It was also noted that they lived in boarding houses, as was the case, he added, with the judges of the Supreme Court and most of the visitors.[4] The taverns at this period and for many years later had but a limited share of what was spoken of as "the greatest and most respectable business that is done in Washington — keeping boarding houses."[5] The business was more or less precarious whether it took the form of a hotel or a boarding house, owing to the shortness of the season which was fixed solely by the sessions of congress. When the national legislature adjourned, some of the boarding houses closed up and only opened when the next session began. The hotels, however, were centres where gatherings of all sorts were held as well as social affairs on a larger scale than possible in the space of the usual residence. The dancing assemblies of the earlier period and the birthnight balls were also given in some hotel. At such a place were held the dinners in honor of some public man or in celebration of some public event. A few months after the Indian Queen Hotel came under the management of Jesse Brown a dinner was given there in honor of Henry Clay, who was then retiring for a time, as it proved, from public life.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 5, 1816, and Oct. 11, 1826.

[2] Announcement in the *Intelligencer*, Nov. 17, 1821, that William Crawford, for fourteen years the proprietor, had retired from the management. He was succeeded by Peter Brady. Eleven years later the building was destroyed by fire (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 28, 1832), and it was not rebuilt for eight years. (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 10, 1840.)

[3] *Intelligencer*, May 23, 1823. Description of the property which was offered for sale by the United States marshal.

[4] See Congressional Directory from 1819 to 1826.

[5] *Intelligencer*, June 20, 1816. Notice of the marriage, by Rev. Stephen B. Balch, of John B. Timberlake, purser in the navy, to Miss Margaret O'Neale.

---

[1] Deed of Bank of Washington to John H. Eaton, J.A.S., Vol. 10, f. 441, June 18, 1848, which recites that in June 25, 1823, by resolution of the directors, all of the O'Neale property was sold to Eaton.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 5, 1829.

[3] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 8, p. 159.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 13, 1819.

[5] The same, Feb. 20 and April 24, 1827.

[6] The same, Oct. 17, 1827.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 19, 1827; Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 6, p. 284.

[2] The same, Sept. 24, 1828.

[3] The same, Sept. 23, 1828.

[4] Etiquette in Washington, 1830, p. 58. It was not until shortly before the civil war that the justices of the Supreme Court occupied residences in the city.

[5] The same, p. 56.

On this occasion he was toasted and made a speech in response, which drew from John Quincy Adams the comment, "This is an English practice which has never been usual in this country."[1] The boarding houses and hotels, as embodying the transient phase of the population of the city, so impressed one observer that he spoke of the city as "a large tavern," for, he adds, "it is nothing more. Everybody is a bird of passage from the president down, and as no one thinks of being at home there, the comfort of home is an unheard-of thing."[2] This phase of the Nation's capital, which has only become subordinate in comparatively recent years, was thought by the *Intelligencer* to be largely responsible for the prejudice against the city, especially on the part of members of congress, whom the editor said confined themselves to their lodgings and made but few acquaintances and did not enter into the social life of the city. "Separated from their families and friends," the editor observed, "solitary, they naturally form some antipathy towards not only the lodgings but the town. Many, too, come here with high-wrought hopes of office, emoluments and honors, and when disappointment comes, it is identified with the place."[3] The idea of the city as a national interest, for the first time since the presidency of John Adams, found expression in the annual messages of the president to congress, when Monroe came to the White House. Jefferson did not find it necessary to discuss District affairs in these papers, although his interest in the city continued throughout the years. His successor, Madison, continued the same course until after the war, when he began the custom, which has been maintained with more or less regularity ever since, of discussing District affairs in the annual messages.

In his first message President Monroe[4] gave expression to the idea of the city as the national centre in which the people of the entire country felt an interest and a pride. He expressed the belief they would see with satisfaction th becoming attractive and worthy of its name as the capital In this respect the president declared the ancient repul were conspicuous, as they had a pride and interest in the improvement and ornament of their metropolis.

---

[1] Memoirs, Vol. 5, p. 330, March 14, 1821.

[2] *Taunton Free Press.* Reprinted in the *Intelligencer*, March 19, 1824.

[3] *Intelligencer*, July 13, 1822.

[4] Messages, Richardson, Vol. 1, p. 588, Dec. 2, 1817.

The editor of the *Intelligencer* was delighted with these wo and also with the approving comments on this part of the m sage from all the leading newspapers of the country, with b a single exception, he added. He quoted but one of thes journalistic utterances, that of a New York paper, and then as if all uncertainty in the path of the District had disappeared the editor exclaimed, "that now a benignant and social feeling towards us is to succeed to that unreasonable jealousy whic has occasionally displayed itself in hostility to our interests and in vain attempts to remove the seat of government."[1]

National pride in the capital city as a city then but feebly found expression.

Three years of the second term of Monroe passed before the south portico of the White House was built so that the members of the president's family could reach the garden without going down into the basement.[2] The east room was still unfinished, and the grounds on the north side of the house only improved in part. The range of offices on the west was used for the stabling of cows owned by the president, while at the end of the range on the east was the stable for eight horses. Along the stable wall near the treasury building were a number of sheds used by clerks in the treasury and state departments, living at a distance, to keep their horses during the day.[3] But the administration of Monroe closed, that of his sor, John Quincy Adams, was finished and more than two of Andrew Jackson's first term passed and the dozen s against the stable between the White House and the easury office were still doing service for the clerks and obstructing the view of the south portico of the White House. The north portico only existed as an architect's design, while e water-supply for the president's family was drawn from mps. But in this latter particular the capitol building was o better off. When a fire broke out in the year 1825 in the library, a few months after the books had been removed o the new room in the centre building, the supply of water from the two pumps in the yard was about exhausted by the time the flames were gotten under control.[1] Seven years before that event, and when the two additional buildings for the use of the executive departments had just been completed, congress made an appropriation to pipe water from the springs in the square bounded by 13th, 14th, K and I streets, northwest, now known as Franklin Park, to reservoirs which were to be made in the vicinity of the White House and the department buildings. But this law of March 3, 1819, was not carried out because it was thought the owners of the lots were exorbitant in their demands.[2] Some four years later the corporation of Washington, by the special assessment plan, made use of a portion of the water-supply of this square and conveyed it by iron pipes sunk in the ground to hydrants in the streets, in the ward between 10th and 15th streets, northwest,[3] just as had been done a few years earlier with the water-supply from the C Street spring.[4] In the meantime and until Andrew Jackson had nearly completed his first term, which ended in

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 17, 1817.

[2] A comparison of the Hoban plan of the White House, as preserved in the collection of Thomas Jefferson Coolidge of Boston, and called to my attention by Mr. Fiske Kimball, with Latrobe's plan of 1807 (plate following p. 47, in Reconstruction of the White House), leads to the conclusion that both the north and south porticos were proposed first in the Latrobe plan.

[3] 20th Congress, 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 69, Feb. 4, 1829. Letter of Charles Bulfinch. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 276.

---

[1] History of Library of Congress, p. 135.

[2] 20th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 69, Feb. 4, 1829. Letter of Charles Bulfinch.

[3] City Ordinance, July 16, 1824; Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 273.

[4] At the session of congress just preceding the burning of the public buildings a company was incorporated with a capital of $50,000 "for the purpose of introducing a copious supply of pure water into Georgetown," but as far as known no attempt was made to exercise the powers conferred.

1833, pumps were the only source of water-supply both at the capitol and the White House and the executive departments.

The latter were for the most part housed in the two buildings flanking the White House on the east and west. An interval of about a year after the British invasion proved to be sufficient to rebuild the treasury office to the east of the White House and near the south line and also the twin structure of the war office on the west. By the spring of 1816, more than a year before the White House was habitable and more than three years before the capitol was ready for the use of the two houses, the department building to the west was occupied by the offices of the state, war and navy departments and several bureaus of the treasury department, while the building on the east was given over wholly to the treasury department.[1] As was the case with the original structures, both were below the then existing grade of the streets and appeared as if built in holes. The rebuilt structures were more substantial in material and workmanship, but were no larger. When congress convened the following fall, President Madison, in his annual message, which was his last, called attention to the extent and variety of the executive business increasing with the progress of the country.[2] What was needed, in the opinion of the president, was the creation of a new executive department to be called the home department, to which could be assigned duties then burdening other departments.[3]

More than thirty years passed before an executive department of the proposed general character was established, but there was no pause in the growth of the executive business of the government. This is reflected not so much in the increase

[1] *Washington City Weekly Gazette*, April 9, 1816.

[2] Annals of Congress, Dec. 3, 1816.

[3] The scope of the proposed department was to include the territorial governments, national highways and canals, the general post-office, which at that period, like the office of the attorney-general, was not a cabinet position, the patent and Indian offices. (The same, p. 23.) In the bill subsequently reported but not enacted into law, all these subjects were included except roads and canals, and in addition it was proposed to place the affairs of the District under the jurisdiction of the new department.

in the civil list in Washington as in the amount of money paid in salaries, as the practice then prevailed of employing temporary clerical aid in addition to the regular force.[1] It was manifest also in the inadequacy of the departmental buildings. As early as the spring of 1816, when the rebuilt buildings were first occupied, it was impossible for all the bureaus to be accommodated in them or in the Blodget building, the only other government-owned structure. For the general land-office, then a bureau of the treasury department and one of growing consequence, was still in the building on the south side of F Street near 13th, northwest, which had been leased after the war.[2] Another bureau that then began to have an importance which it has never lost, as it carried out the generous policy of the government in pensioning those who served in the army and the navy, was at an early date located in a rented building.[3] The navy department occupied several rented buildings and so did the war department, while the department of state was only obliged to lease a house "where the messenger resides."[4] In fact all of the then four executive departments leased buildings to supplement what was provided by the government. The pressure for room was such that notice was served on the offices of the branch of the second Bank of the United States that the two rooms in the treasury building occupied by the bank must be given up.[5] A few months later the bank, after about a year in the treasury office, was in the building at the northeast corner of 13th and F streets formerly owned and occupied by the branch of the first Bank of the United States.[1] The situation became so acute in the public offices that less than two years after the rebuilding of the department buildings, the president in his annual message called the attention of congress to the lack of room to carry on the public business. A committee of the house, after reading statements from the heads of the departments, came to the same conclusion and reported a bill providing for the erection of two buildings similar to the two flanking the White House and to be located directly to the north of them.[2] The plans and estimate of cost furnished by James Hoban were also submitted as a part of the report, and before the session closed an appropriation was made. In the course of a year the brick buildings were completed. They were in design the same as the older structures, but were somewhat larger and had in addition on the north fronts porticos with freestone pillars, which were thought to be quite an attractive feature.[3] With this provision for housing the executive department by doubling the current accommodations in public buildings, congress rested content for many years. For a time at least the use of rented buildings ceased.[4] No attempt, however, was made to remedy the defective organization of the departments. Eight years after Madison had brought the subject to the attention of congress, President John Quincy Adams declared in an annual message that the executive departments were "still confined to their primitive organization and are now inadequate to the urgent needs of a still growing community. The departments of foreign affairs and of the interior, which early after the formation of the government had been united in one, continues so united at this time to the unquestionable detriment of the public service."[1] While almost a quarter of a century passed before a home or interior department was established, yet it was not because the subject was ignored, either in congress or in the public press. Some months before Mr. Adams's message was laid before congress, the organization of an interior department was advocated, not to relieve the pressure upon other departments, but as a medium for collecting and diffusing information relative to the agricultural, manufacturing and commercial needs of the country and their development.[2] The author of this ambitious and comprehensive scheme, which anticipated the department of agriculture and the department of commerce, was A. B. Woodward, who vainly attempted some twenty years earlier to induce congress to give the District representation in congress and a local legislature. He had spent nineteen years on the bench in Michigan, but had been legislated out of office as a means of ridding the court of a man whose eccentricities impaired his usefulness. He had not fully developed a scheme which was ambitious enough to seek a classification of all human knowledge when he came back to Washington, and which he did not complete, as President Monroe appointed him in 1824 a judge in Florida, where he died three years later. His only published writings are the essays on the government of the District and a treatise on "The Substance of the Sun," published in 1809.[3]

---

[1] In 1808 the salary list in the executive departments aggregated $142,352, while in 1816 it had reached $274,442, an increase of 93 per cent. In 1820 the amount disbursed was $353,097, an increase in the four years of 28 per cent. (American State Papers, p. 641, Jan. 31, 1821.) In 1816 the officers, clerks and other employés numbered 240 and in 1822, 265. (The same, pp. 307 and 978.)

[2] *City of Washington Gazette*, May 5, 1818.

[3] At first on the north side of F Street, a short distance east of 13th Street, northwest. (*Intelligencer*, Nov. 21, 1818.) After the additional department buildings were erected the pension office apparently was quartered in one of them, where it remained presumably some fifteen years and was then removed to a rented building on 17th Street, opposite the war office. (*Intelligencer*, March 31, 1832.)

[4] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 470, Jan. 26, 1818.

[5] The same.

---

[1] *City of Washington Gazette*, May 5, 1818.

[2] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 472, Jan. 26, 1818.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 16, 1819. The two buildings east of the White House were known as the state and treasury departments, while those on the west as the war and navy departments; the most northern building on the east being the state department, while that on the west was the war department.

[4] In the list of public offices and their location, Washington Directory for 1822, p. 85, all are in government buildings.

Another phase in the development of the business of the government soon became prominent, and that was the demand for better salaries. Changes had been made from time to time in the salaries of some of the principal executive officers, and when new offices were created, the salaries provided recognized the advance that had taken place in the cost of living. The pay of clerks had also been somewhat increased during this period, for while specific appropriations were not made, yet in the distribution of the money appropriated in bulk for salaries for each department[1] larger individual allowances were made.

---

[1] Messages, Richardson, Vol. 2, p. 880, Dec. 6, 1825.

[2] *Intelligencer*, April 7, 1825; also the issues of April 22 and 25.

[3] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 4, p. 114.

Members of congress, however, still continued to receive $6 per day and mileage, which was the rate established by the first congress. It was claimed that it was impossible to make the same amount of money go as far in Washington as was done a quarter of a century ago in New York and Philadelphia. So during the winter of 1816 a bill was passed changing the compensation from a daily to an annual allowance. Instead of $6 per day and mileage $1500 a year and mileage was received, an increase, it was estimated, of fifty per cent.[2] However, in the country districts, where the bulk of the people of that day lived, and to some extent in the towns $6 a day seemed to be high pay. When it was increased, then the members began to hear from home. In addition to this source of annoyance the public officers of various sorts, judicial as well as executive, presented their claims for higher pay. The outcome was a committee report in favor of a fifty per cent increase in salaries fixed in 1790, of cabinet officers, foreign ministers and heads of departments. In the meanwhile, however, the opportunity was not lost in emphasizing the course of congress in looking after the interests of its own members, while the government officials of all grades and the clerks were entirely neglected.[3] In Washington, where government salaries were one of the vital public interests, congress was not openly assailed. Under the guise of a newspaper controversy between rival barbers the cause of the government employé was upheld.

Owing to the increase in the compensation of members of congress, the first of these ironical notices read: the rates for shaving will be advanced fifty per cent, but there will be no change in the rate to government clerks, as their pay was not increased.[1] This excited the indignation of another member of the craft, who informed the public there will be no discrimination at his shop, as all men will be charged alike. It was asserted that the author of this discrimination was prompted, not by sympathy for the distressed situation of the clerks, but by his chagrin "at learning that the benevolent barbers of the District not only refuse to accept any compensation for shaving the honorable members of congress, but actually paid at the rate of eight to nine per cent for permission to perform the operation."

---

[1] Stats., 2, 396, April 21, 1806.

[2] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 299, March 22, 1816; also same, p. 403.

[3] At the very next session a house committee made a long report in defence of its course on the salary question. American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 403, Dec. 18, 1816.

In the course of two or three years an increase was made in the salaries of the cabinet officers and also in the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court and of the circuit court of the District.[2]

The pay of the clerks was not changed although the agitation continued.[3] In the meantime a counter-movement was started by a man engaged in the business of prosecuting government claims, who asserted that government clerks were acting as claim agents.[4] The implication was that these clerks enjoyed an unfair advantage and were making an improper use of their knowledge of the government archives. A year or so before similar accusations had been made against clerks in the post-office department, which had been investigated without discovering wrong-doing.[5] At this time it was said in one of the local newspapers that it was true some of the clerks had business connections outside of the government, but that was a practice of long standing and arose from the necessity of supplementing their salaries in order to support their families. However, was the spirited comment, they are doing no more than members of congress, who make "no scruple to leave their seats in the halls of congress to pursue professional affairs in the Supreme Court."[1] The subject was brought to the attention of the house, which gave an opportunity for the display of a feeling that if not exactly unfriendly to the government clerk, at any rate indicated a belief that this class had a pretty easy time and did not really earn the salaries paid.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 24, 1816; also the 26th and 27th for the replies.

[2] By the act of March 2, 1799, the secretaries of state and treasury were paid $5000, the secretaries of war and navy $4500, the attorney-general and the postmaster-general $3000. No change was made until by act of Feb. 20, 1819, the secretaries of state, treasury, war and navy received $6000, the postmaster-general $4000 and the attorney-general $3500. The chief judge of the District court by a law of 1818 received an addition of $500 to a salary of $2200 fixed in 1811, and the associate judges the same addition to a salary of $2000.

[3] Series of articles on the mode of employing and compensation of government clerks. *Intelligencer*, December, 1817.

[4] Annals of Congress, Jan. 16, 1818, p. 783.

[5] American State Papers, Post-office Department, p. 50, March 27, 1816.

An inquiry was made, with the result that while no evidence of improper or dishonest conduct was discovered, and in fact only six or seven of a total of some 240 in the District civil list were found to be engaged in the claim business, yet the conclusion was very properly reached that the tendency was dangerous, and the recommendation was made that clerks be prohibited not only from acting as claim agents but also from engaging in any business of trade.[2] Up to this time there had been no restriction placed upon the liberty of the government clerk to do as he pleased with his time outside of office hours, except soon after the government was established a law was passed restricting treasury employés from any sort of trade or business, which, however, was modified by the act of May 8, 1792, when the restrictions were entirely removed except as to dealings in the funds or debts of the United States or those of the states. It may be considered that this law was in reality a recognition of the right of the treasury clerk to have business interests if he desired or at least to place him on an equality in this respect with those in the other departments.

The recommendations of the committee were not enacted into law. A month after the report was made the government clerks joined in the demand which had been made upon congress on behalf of government officials for an increase in pay.[3]

---

[1] *City of Washington Gazette*, Jan. 17, 1818.

[2] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 497, March 20, 1818.

[3] Annals of Congress, April 14, 1818, p. 1722.

A bill granting this request passed both houses in one form and then another, but, owing to amendments, congress adjourned before final action was reached.

While the prohibitions as to outside employment recommended by the committee were not given the sanction of law, it was made the subject of departmental regulation. Four years later, in a report made to congress on the number of clerks employed in the several departments and whether more were on the rolls than were required and whether they were engaged in outside work, not a single clerk is reported as being in the claim business and only a few as having any outside interests at all, and none that interfered with the official time or work.[1] Although the memorial of the clerks asking for more money did not result in action by congress, still at the same session a law was passed for the first time arranging the government clerks in classes according to compensation.[2] From some ten years following, or until Andrew Jackson became president, the annual appropriation bill provided for a specified number of clerks in each class. Then a return was made to the old system of appropriating for salaries a sum in bulk for each department to be apportioned as the head of the department might see fit. Under that system the entire amount available was not always apportioned and the balance was used in part to pay for extra clerical help, and what was left was divided at the end of the year among the clerks. As can be readily appreciated discretionary power of that sort was fruitful of suspicion, if not of abuse, as is plainly evident from the statements made before the committee of investigation.[3]

At the same time while the scale of salaries was fixed for the first time, yet as it did not differ materially from the one in use, the financial condition of the clerical force was not very much improved. While congress was thus solicitous about some phases of the service rendered by employés of the executive departments, no attempt was made to fix the office hours. This was left as before as a matter entirely of departmental regulation. From the outset of the establishment of the government, apparently, the departments were opened for business at nine o'clock each day. The closing hour when the removal took place to Washington was presumably two o'clock. In the fall of 1817, when John Quincy Adams became secretary of state, he found the office hours at that department were from nine to three o'clock.[1] A few months later, it was said on the floor of the house, that the office hours were from ten to three. But the clerks, a discontented member observed, were not always there even at that hour, and he added that they "come when they please and turn the key and go when they please."[2] Four years later the house adopted a resolution favoring the abolition of "the practice which has obtained in the public offices of the city of not attending to business until nine or ten o'clock in the morning and closing the offices at three in the evening."[3] But nothing was done and no change was made in the office hours for many years.

---

[1] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 978, Dec. 3, 1822.

[2] The classes were $1600, $1400, $1050, $1000 and $800. Act of April 20, 1818.

[3] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 507, Dec. 3, 1822.

The small size of the clerical force as well as the practice of assigning to each clerk a fixed amount of work no doubt explains the apparent laxness that prevailed in regard to hours.[4] If the clerk did the amount regarded as a day's work in less time or chose to do a double amount one day and be absent the next, those were matters left to the individual discretion. In the summer season, the committee was told, the clerks in the post-office department "attend to business an hour earlier than in most of the other departments and for that reason are not rigidly confined to the hour of 3 o'clock P.M."

At this period no regular provision was made for vacations, "but every man in the government service calculates upon an occasional recess," so the house committee was told in 1818. Four years later the secretary of state, John Quincy Adams, informed congress that "occasional absences for a few days are indulged in turn to all."[1] It was not only the hours and the pay of the clerks that were discussed and made the subject of departmental regulation, but also their morals and especially whether they paid their debts. Even the great champion of the common people, Andrew Jackson, towards the close of his second term issued an order to the heads of departments directing that a monthly report be made of the moral habits of each clerk and public officer and that they be required to pay their debts on pain of immediate removal.[2] On the other hand, the injustice of the system of federal employment was pointed out, which provides salaries so that in some cases it is impossible by the most rigid economy to make both ends meet.[3] Yet when a clerk had exhausted his resources, complaints are made and he is discharged. No doubt the response to such a statement was similar to that which was heard when residents of the District found fault with the government of the District. Then they were told that they were not obliged to live in the District, a reply more specious than satisfactory or convincing. It was admitted that a salary of $800 or $1000 was sufficient to maintain young men who have no dependents in a city like Washington, where living was high, but it was not enough for a man with a family.[4] Twenty years after the first effort congress was again memorialized by the clerks, accompanied by a statement from the heads of the departments and the executive officers, indorsing the request for higher pay, but

---

[1] Memoirs, Vol. 4, p. 9.

[2] Annals of Congress, Jan. 16, 1818, p. 783.

[3] The same, May 1, 1822, p. 1768.

[4] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 505.

---

[1] American State Papers, Miscella, Vol. 2, p. 979.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 4, 1835.

[3] The same, March 7, 1836.

[4] The writer of a communication in the *Intelligencer* of March 7, 1836, estimates board for a man, his wife, one child and a nurse at

$11.50 per week, making per annum	$598
Fuel including sawing, putting away, etc.	40
Washing for 4	48
Milk for one child, oil, etc.	30
Nurse hire, $4 per month	48
Medical attendance, postage, etc.	75
	839

As the writer pointed out, no allowance in above is made for clothing or deaths or births.

without result.[1] About a third of a century after the formation of the government, only two superannuated clerks were reported in the entire number of 265. One of these, John Craven, had commenced his service as clerk in the year 1799. Twenty-three years later he was eighty-one years of age and his strength was impaired. "He is, however," his department chief stated in 1822, "one of the most attentive and does all in his power." He died seven years later. General David Henley at that time was seventy-four years of age. With the exception of an interval of twelve years he had been in the service of the United States from the year 1775 and had rendered distinguished service in the army of the Revolution, reaching the rank of general. At that period he was incapable of performing the duties of a clerk, "but from his recollection of revolutionary events he is useful in the examination of revolutionary claims."[2] About the time the movement began for an increase in the pay of clerks, a benefit association was organized limited to clerks employed in the civil department of the government.[3] In the course of two years a charter was granted by congress, under the terms of which the members paid into the association $10 a year, with the condition that at their death at the expiration of the first year or within five years their families were to receive twice the amount paid in; within the sixth year $200, the seventh year $300, increasing each year until the eleventh, when they were to receive not more than $800. A failure to pay the annual dues deprived a member of the right to anything paid in, but ceasing to be a clerk or removing out of the District did not make membership void. For the first eighteen years the average membership was sixty, or about twenty per cent of the entire civil list.[1] The government service then, as has been the case since, had many men of ability and attainments. As has been pointed out, the early scientific societies, the Columbian Institute and the Botanic Society, drew their membership principally from this class. The pastors of five of the early city churches were in the clerical service, and there were three clerks who held the office, important in that day, of justices of the peace. Phineas Bradley, one of the assistant postmaster-generals, was president of the Patriotic Bank.[2]

---

[1] 25th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 239, Feb. 26, 1838.

[2] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 979. In the year 1822 there were five clerks in the fifth auditor's office who had been in the government service for from 22 to 24 years. The veteran in point of service at that time was Joseph Nourse, register of the treasury since 1789, who began in 1779, and at the time of his dismissal at the beginning of the Jackson administration had a record of more than 50 years. (*Intelligencer*, June 21, 1829.) John Woodside, who served nearly as long, was appointed in the treasury department in 1785, and continued in the service until a short time before his death in 1835 at the age of 86. (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 4, 1835.)

[3] *Intelligencer*, March 22, 1818. Notice of the first annual meeting. Also notice of meeting (same, April 3, 1843) when the association was nearly twenty-six years old.

After a service of six years as clerk in the state department John Bailey, who had previously been a member of the Massachusetts legislature, was elected in 1823 to the national house to represent a district in his state and served four terms. While holding the position of messenger in the navy department, Samuel Chase, son of the man who was the central figure in the first national impeachment trial, was appointed in 1827 judge of the orphans' court of Washington County, retaining that position until his death in 1841.[3] A clerk in the pension office was in 1821 selected by the secretary of state to make the necessary observations to determine the meridian of Washington. This was William Lambert, an Englishman, who memorialized congress on this subject as early as 1809. He was assisted in the work by William Elliot, a clerk in the patent office, who was also from England and had been a teacher of mathematics. He had an observatory at the rear of his house, 222 North Capitol Street, where observations were carried on. Mr. Elliot also served as surveyor of the city, succeeding in that office F. C. De Kraft, who was also in the government service. Associated with Mr. De Kraft as a draughtsman in the land-office was Robert King, who was appointed in 1804 and held the office until his death twenty-seven years later.[1] During the early portion of this period Mr. King was employed in the surveying department of the city and also as surveyor of the city.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 3, 1837. Statement of Charles W. Goldsborough, president of the association. Up to that time the deaths numbered 33. They had paid in $3312 and their families had received $10,997. In the year 1843 there had been paid to the families of fifty deceased members $19,239, and the payments received from these members amounted to $5895. *Intelligencer*, April 3, 1843.

[2] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 978.

[3] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 7, p. 239, March 15, 1827. Samuel Chase succeeded Richard Bland Lee, who after a service of eight years had died. After holding this position for eleven years, Judge Chase, on account of the debility of age, was unable to perform the duties. On June 5, 1838, Nathaniel P. Causin was appointed additional judge. (*Intelligencer*, May 5, 1841.) At the time Mr. Lee was appointed, Henry C. Neale succeeded James H. Blake as register of wills. The latter was appointed July, 1818, and served one year. Dr. Blake's predecessor, John Hewitt, was the first incumbent of the office, serving from April, 1801, to July, 1818.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 7, 1831.

CHAPTER IV

ERECTION OF THE CITY HALL

A FEW months after the opening of the year 1820 and after the circuit court was established in the Brick Capitol, the city government, anticipating the golden fortune that was to fall from the wheels of the city lottery then industriously turning, began to prepare to spend a portion of the expected proceeds in the erection of a city hall. In response to an advertisement of the mayor offering $300 for the plans and specifications of a building to cost $100,000,[1] George Hadfield, at one time architect of the capitol, submitted a design which at once caught the fancy of the city council. There were no estimates of cost, but the council adopted the plan, and then when it was found the building would cost about three quarters of a million, the drawings were returned to the architect, who reduced the size. After deciding upon a plan, the city council appointed a commission to superintend its execution.[2] It is typical of the strong feeling between the different sections of the city that while the city council could agree upon a design for the building and the men to have charge of its construction and upon the expenditure of the largest single sum of money that had ever been proposed to be spent by the city government, yet no decision could be reached as to the site. The commission was expected to do that, and it did choose apparently between Judiciary Square and the public reservation on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 3d Street and John Marshall Place. A motive for picking out the latter site, so near Judiciary Square and yet no nearer to Capitol Hill or Georgetown, may be found in the current agitation both in and out of congress in favor of the improvement of lower Pennsylvania Avenue. As the president did not give his assent to the use of that portion of the public property, the decision as to the site was changed, and the foundations for the building, which is still standing, were begun on Judiciary Square.[1] There the corner-stone was laid by the Grand Lodge of Masons of the District, William Hewitt, for many years the register of the city, being the Grand Master.[2]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 7, 1820.

[2] The same, July 14, 1820; *City of Washington Gazette*, July 22, 1820. The members of the commission were Samuel N. Smallwood, the mayor of the city, R. C. Weightman and William Prout of the board of aldermen, Thomas Carbery and John P. Ingle of the common council.

As the first civic procession in the history of the city[3] this line of masons, city officials and citizens, as it passed down Pennsylvania Avenue from Strother's Hotel at 14th Street, was a notable one. It had in the current estimate, no doubt, a still greater importance as marking the beginning of a structure the largest in the city thus far attempted except by the federal government. In less than two years after the throng collected about the corner-stone had dispersed the offices of the mayor and the register of the city were removed to the new building and where also the following weeks the city councils for the first time assembled.[4] The city hall, however, was by no means complete. Only forty per cent of the estimated cost had been expended. The pillared portico of the centre of the south front and the colonnades of the two wings were not in place. Walls of rough brick, unrelieved by the color effect and soft outlines of the intended stucco finish, stood gaunt and bare in the midst of the neglected commons at the head of John Marshall Place. But the city had already spent on the building more than its income justified. It was expected the proceeds of the lottery would be ample to reimburse the city treasury, but a new difficulty was encountered the second year after the building was begun, as several of the states prohibited the sale within their borders of lottery tickets.[1] In a little more than a year the entire lottery enterprise collapsed, owing to the dishonesty of the manager.[2] Congress, however, rendered timely aid at this period through an appropriation of $10,000 to have rooms not alone fitted up but purchased for the use of the circuit court and the clerk and the marshal. The law further directed that no rent should be paid.[3] Some time during the year 1823–1824 the circuit court and the clerks' office and the office of the marshal were removed from the Brick Capitol to the east wing of the city hall, and in that structure all these offices have been located ever since.[4] At this period began the joint ownership of the city hall by the general government and the city. Again, as had been the case from the creation of the court with the exception of the previous four years, the item of rent was cut out of the appropriation made each year by congress for the judicial establishment of Washington County. But provision was made each year from the federal treasury, as had been the practice from the beginning, for the salaries of the judges, the district attorney, court officers, for witness fees and other expenses, just as was done in the case of other federal courts. Both the clerk of the court and the marshal as well as the judges of the orphans' court and the registers of wills were fee officers.[1] After the year 1815 the personnel of the court remained unchanged for a period of thirty years. In that year James S. Morsell, a member of the bar living in Georgetown, was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Nicholas Fitzhugh.[2] As the third resident of the District given a place on the bench of the court — William Cranch and James Marshall being the other two — it may be presumed the citizens were gratified, but if so, there was no public expression. In several particulars the judicial system of the District was not satisfactory. The chief defect had its origin in the careless haste of congress to provide a system of laws for the District. If this system had taken the form of a code or had been improved and modernized from time to time, it would have been better adapted to the needs of the District.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 14, 1820.

[2] This was the third event of the kind when the Grand Lodge had officiated since its organization in 1811. Its first public appearance was Sept. 14, 1815, when the corner-stone of St. John's Episcopal Church, 16th and H streets, was laid, and the second, on July 29, 1820, on the occasion of the corner-stone laying of the Second Presbyterian Church, 13th Street and New York Avenue. History of the Grand Lodge, p. 54; also the pamphlet, Ceremonies and Orations at Laying the Corner-stone of the City Hall, p. 5.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 19, 1820.

[4] The same, June 5, 1822. Announcing the removal to the city hall of the offices of the mayor and the register from the Weightman building at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th Street, where they had been established two years before. (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 15, 1820.) For thirteen years prior to 1818 the two bodies of the city council and the city officials occupied rooms in the Union Masonic Lodge building on 11th Street.

---

[1] Memorial of the corporation of Washington addressed to the legislatures of the various states. *Intelligencer*, Dec. 12, 1821.

[2] *Intelligencer*, March 22, 1823.

[3] Stats., 3, 785, March 3, 1823.

[4] In the year 1824 the orphans' court and the office of register of wills, which had occupied from their establishment rented buildings, were removed to the city hall, where they have since remained. (Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 277.) At that time these offices were on the west side of 13th Street between E and F streets. (Directory of 1822.)

Congress, however, in 1801, merely by inserting in a law a paragraph of some seven lines, saddled upon the District by the wholesale all the laws of Maryland and Virginia "as they now exist." In those states up to that time a large proportion of laws of English origin and the colonial statutes had remained unchanged. Since then, however, in both states the legislatures had modified or superseded the old laws by enactments in harmony with existing conditions and needs. But in the District, where growth of population and change in condition had marked every phase of human activity, the laws remained immobile under the reign of congress, "parental in its regards," as one observer asserted, "but necessarily sparing in its benefactions." [3] With a body of laws designed for the most part for an age then past and recognizing no change in customs or in manners, the court was needlessly hampered. In addition, when the court sat in Alexandria, it was governed by the Virginia laws, and when the term was held in Washington, by the

---

[1] By the law of May 29, 1830, salaries were substituted for fees in the case of the orphans' court judges.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 12, 1815. His associates on the bench were William Cranch and Buckner Thurston.

[3] The same. Oct. 21, 1818.

Maryland laws. The great extent of the laws, the mere mass, as well as the obsolete character of a great part at first directed the effort towards betterment in securing the adoption of a code. But, as stated elsewhere, this movement failed. The earliest criticism of the system, the first protest, was based not on the extent of the jurisdiction given to the single court in the District or even the expense where the court fees were those of the United States courts instead of the more modest scale of the state courts. Both of these phases received early attention. What the community was sensitive about and what aroused the indignation of some members of congress was the retention on the statute books of the District of the inhuman laws of a past age, reflecting barbarous customs and cruel indifference to human life and suffering. It was these old sanguinary, criminal laws, unchanged since 1801, upon which fell the fierceness of denunciation.[1] It was not that these bloody laws were carried out, for public sentiment would not permit it. Still it was felt to be a disgrace to the community that such enactments were allowed to remain in force, and what was of more practical consequence, it was difficult to substitute proper penalties for the harsh punishments, repugnant in that age. It was this phase of the situation that led to the movement for the erection of a penitentiary, as had been done first in Pennsylvania in 1794 with such satisfactory results and since then in other states. The benefits of such a penal institution, declared Judge Thurston in a charge to the grand jury a year after the war, can be extended to the District, "instead of hangings, whippings, burning on the hand, etc." [2]

There is no record that after the year 1817 a sentence of branding a prisoner was executed. In that year, during a term of the circuit court held in the capitol, a man convicted of bigamy was branded with the letter T on the hand in open court.[3] So abhorrent was such a mode of punishment that the *Intelligencer* characterized it as "barbarous, at least a century too old for the refinement of the present age." While it is true that but few essential changes were made in the general laws of the District until nearly the close of the first third of the century,[1] yet as stated the severity of the ancient laws was mitigated or ignored in the actual administration. Two typical cases illustrate how it was done. By the old Maryland law in force in Washington County, larceny was punished by death or labor upon the roads. In practice this law was ignored and larceny was punished under the United States law of April 30, 1790, which made larceny committed in any of the places under the jurisdiction of the United States punishable by fine and whipping.[2] In Alexandria County, in order to avoid the rigors of the Virginia law of 1792, which made housebreaking a capital offence, juries would find a verdict of simple larceny.[3] These old-time laws and their antique penalties furnished effective weapons to the hands of those who believed that the government of the District ought to be changed, as congress was incompetent for the task. But they became more effective when employed in advocacy of such a measure as the penitentiary bill which was enacted into law in 1826. Then it was pointed out in the house that in a territory under the exclusive legislation of congress and in Alexandria County alone the law punished thirty crimes with death, while in Washington County there were fourteen capital crimes.[4] Among the capital crimes were burglary to the extent of $4; breaking out of prison by a person charged with felony; a slave preparing or giving medicine with bad intent; maliciously burning any house; breaking or entering a storehouse or tobacco house or stealing to the value of five shillings. On the Virginia side of the river it was said the life of a man is valued at $4, while on the Maryland side the price is but five shillings. The whipping-post as a mode of punishment, except in the case of slaves, was apparently as objectionable as branding, but was continued in use until by the law of March 3, 1831, which modernized the criminal laws, imprisonment was substituted except for slaves. For the first fifty years of the circuit court but three sentences of hanging were carried out, although they were imposed in a number of cases, but were set aside by executive clemency, in most cases because the penalty was excessive. The judge and the jury also lent their aid in humanizing the laws.[1] While public sentiment did not approve of the judicial taking of life for what had come to be regarded as insufficient causes, still it was recognized that wrong-doing must be punished and that mere imprisonment was neither humane nor economic. From the summer of 1814, when provision in the lottery scheme was made by the city council for a fund to erect a penitentiary, to the passage by congress twelve years later of the law providing for the building in the city of Washington of what was the first national penitentiary, the efforts made to secure such an institution were continuous and even included a futile attempt to get the three discordant towns behind the proposition.[2] Differences of opinion were developed as to how such an institution could be secured, but all were apparently united as to the urgent need. For then "instead of being obliged to resort to branding on the hands, and exposing the persons of criminals, even women, at the whipping-post or condemning them to an inactive confinement in the pestilential cells of a loathsome dungeon, as the only alternative to absolute immunity," sentence to labor in the penitentiary could be imposed.[3] As to the means, a committee appointed at a meeting of delegates from various portions of the District recommended that congress be asked to authorize a tax on auctions and marriage licenses as the share of the District, while the public treasury should aid to an extent "equal to the benefit which the proposed institution directly confers on the Nation."[1] As subsequently pointed out by the editor of the *Intelligencer*, "the principal use of a penitentiary arises from our central position, the city being a great resort for strangers, so that we shall always be subject to the expense and trouble of punishing rogues for other states, but particularly for the United States."[2] This emphasis upon a phase of the national centre, the addition of burdens due entirely to its being the capital city, was brought out in a newspaper communication protesting against asking aid from congress for such a purpose. "The District," the writer urged, "is able to provide one on a suitable scale without the aid of congress. We may not have it in our power to erect a penitentiary to suit the wild wishes of some projectors of public improvements, but we certainly have it in our power to erect one that will answer the real intention of such an institution, good enough for any one who may seek a residence in it."[3]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 20, 1817; Register of Debates, p. 1475, March 1, 1826.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 9, 1815.

[3] The same, June 20, 1817.

---

[1] Report of House District Committee on the State of the Laws. 21st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 268, March 3, 1830.

[2] Cranch C. C. Reports, Vol. 2, p. 195, 1819.

[3] The same, p. 198.

[4] Register of Debates, p. 1475, March 1, 1826.

---

[1] At the June term of the court in 1816 (*Intelligencer*, June 19) the cases of two colored men charged with capital crimes were disposed of. One accused of the death of his wife was found guilty of manslaughter and was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment and a fine of $100. The other case was that of a man indicted for highway robbery in taking a watch and $10 from a wagon on the road above Georgetown. A death sentence was imposed as the law required, but he was recommended to the mercy of the president.

[2] *Intelligencer*, March 26 and Nov. 29, 1820.

[3] The same, Oct. 21, 1818.

There is perhaps no better illustration of the blending of federal and local interests, and how from the necessity of the case it must be so, than this fragment of opposing views of only one aspect of those relations and interests. It was true then as it is to-day that a prison for the reception of those sentenced by local courts is a local affair; at the same time the inequity was recognized of placing the burden on a single community for the support and care of a class largely made up of those drawn to the city because it was the Nation's capital. It was also quite true that the municipal resources were equal to providing a place that would be entirely suitable for a community of the size and wealth of the city of Washington. But would it be worthy of the Nation's capital or capable of caring for a number abnormal in a town of a similar size?

This interwoven relation between the government and city, between the national capital and the city of Washington, for over forty years has had the sanction of law, but then it was only beginning to be seen and that rather dimly. Even to this day voices are heard in legislative halls insisting that there is a dividing line between the interests of the city of Washington and of the national capital.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 8, 1820.

[2] The same, Nov. 27, 1820.

[3] The same.

After the lottery proved a failure congress in 1826 decided to establish a penitentiary. It was national in its scope. There were to be incarcerated persons convicted of offences under the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia. The board of five inspectors, the law stipulated, was to be chosen by the president of the United States from the inhabitants of the District, not merely from the county of Washington.[1] The law of March 3, 1829, gave the sanction of congress to the convict labor system, as the warden was authorized to let out the labor of convicts by contract. On the other hand, as typical of a more modern spirit, provision was made "for the separate labor and instruction of any convict under the age of fourteen" and to enforce such regulations as may "most conduce to the reformation and instruction of such youthful offenders."[2] A few months after the penitentiary bill became a law and before the site was selected, a writer of a communication printed in the *Intelligencer*[3] expressed the judgment that as it was to be a national institution, for the reception of prisoners from other portions of the country, the northern section of the reservation at Greenleaf

---

[1] The first board as appointed by President Jackson was composed of the following: Henry Ashton, Thomas Carbery, William O'Neale of the city of Washington, Thompson F. Mason of Alexandria and James Dunlop of Georgetown. The choice of warden had no geographical limits, and the president selected Benjamin Williams of Virginia. (*Intelligencer*, April 1, 1829.) By the law of Feb. 25, 1831, the appointment of the warden was made subject to confirmation by the senate, and the board of inspectors was reduced to three members.

[2] It is quite evident the board of inspectors was doubtful from the outset of the practicability of combining in one institution a penitentiary and a reform school, for in its first report to congress, stating that the penitentiary was ready to receive prisoners, the establishment of a house of reform or refuge for juvenile delinquents was recommended. *Intelligencer*, Feb. 24, 1830.

[3] June 6, 1826.

Point at the foot of 4½ Street would be the most suitable site, as an "institution national in character ought to have an easy approach by water from every part of the United States, so that the prisoners might be landed, as at the tower in London, immediately at the place of confinement." It is probable this parallel was not a factor in the choice. At any rate that was the site selected by the commission appointed by the president.[1] The building was erected under the direction of the commissioner of public buildings. It was a long structure of brick, the warden's house forming one wing and the hospital the other. It stood about three hundred feet south of and opposite the 4½ Street entrance to the grounds.

With the introduction of the penitentiary system a more effective administration of justice was made possible. It was only secured after some twelve years of effort, an experience which if confined solely to the course of congress towards the District would no doubt have had the effect of recruiting largely the ranks of those who really were sceptical about the practicability of government of the District by the national legislature. For the District did not stand alone in the failure of congress to realize legislative hopes. Four years after the penitentiary had been secured for the District, the representative in the house from Missouri, then but nine years in the Union, declared on the floor that he despaired, by the manner in which the business in the house was performed, to be able to get anything for Missouri.[2] It must be borne in mind that the penitentiary bill was a money measure, calling not only for an appropriation of about $100,000 for the erection of the building, but, as it was entirely a government institution, for an annual maintenance charge, although the law in faint hope enjoined upon the inspectors the duty of so managing its affairs that "if it be possible the proceeds of the labor of the said convicts shall pay all the expenses of the penitentiary and more."

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 1, 1826. The commission consisted of Chief Judge William Cranch, Dr. Henry Huntt and Walter Smith.

[2] Register of Debates, p. 722, April 4, 1830.

The next measure of relief in the operation of laws was secured in four years. This was brought about by a clause in a law extending the jurisdiction of justices of the peace from $20 to $50 in cases of debt and damage.[1] For some time it had been realized that the circuit court was overburdened, and the remedy most generally favored was to turn over its lesser functions to some lower tribunal, — a magistrate's court for each county or a mayor's court for each city.[2] Another suggestion was presented in a memorial to congress by Francis Scott Key and other citizens of Georgetown, asking for a separate court with civil and criminal jurisdiction to be held in Georgetown by one of the judges of the circuit court.[3] The *Intelligencer* declared "the number of suits depending in our courts is so great we are ashamed to state it. It does no credit to our lame judicial system."[4] The previous February the term of the court ended without completing scarcely more than one-half of the vast mass of business.[5] At the same time, while the attention of congress was being directed to the clogged judicial machinery of the District and resolutions were adopted in the house to extend the jurisdiction of justices of the peace, it was proposed that the expenses of jurors and witnesses in the circuit court be paid by the two counties instead of the United States.[6] It was asserted that the government had expended for holding courts within the District the past nineteen years an average of about $11,000 each year.[7] One speaker, overlooking the federal status of the court, declared he saw no reason why congress should defray such expenses in the District any more than in the most distant county. The office of clerk of the court was said to be the most lucrative in the United States. However, the senate failed to agree with the house in this particular. By freeing the circuit court of cases for debt and damages less than $50 and directing the flood of such minor causes into the jurisdiction of the justices of the peace it was found in the course of two years that the business of the court was less than it had been for ten years. Instead of 1300 civil actions, the number had fallen to 150. "It is probable," the editor of the *Intelligencer* said, "the extension of the jurisdiction of the magistrates had some but no great agency in curtailing the business of the circuit court."[1] He rather attributed it to a decline in the spirit of litigation. The more humane spirit of the age was reflected in a paragraph in the same law, which prohibited the imprisonment of women for debt and of all men above seventy years of age, a step towards the entire abolition of imprisonment for debt, as the editor of the *Intelligencer* asserted.[2] He added it was evident from the debates in congress that that body was "decidedly in favor of the abolition in its own courts of this legalized kidnapping." He asserted that only lack of time prevented the passage of the measure that session. It is quite apparent this prediction was too sanguine, for twenty-one years passed before congress placed on the statute books such a measure which had been recommended in the first report on the subject made in the year 1821.[3] At this earlier date it was proposed to prohibit the issue of processes by the courts of the United States for the seizure of the person of the debtor, a practice which, "sanctioned by ancient custom, seems to have had its origin in an age of barbarism."[4] Three years later, when the subject was again before congress, it was proposed to include the District in the scope of the proposed law.[5]

---

[1] Stats., 3, 743, March 1, 1823.

[2] *Intelligencer*, July 11, 1820.

[3] The same, Jan. 9, 1819. Annals of Congress, p. 440, May 4, 1820.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 14, 1820.

[5] The same, Feb. 5, 1820.

[6] Annals of Congress, Jan. 20, 1820, p. 930.

[7] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 2, p. 581. Report of Committee on Judicial Expenses in the District.

This measure of relief was not given at this time to the District any more than to the states, although with Kentucky leading the way in 1821 in doing away with the prison penalty for debt, followed by North Carolina and Missouri and then state after state, the anomalous condition of processes being granted against the body of debtors by courts of the United States in states where such processes could not be issued by the state courts was continued for nearly twenty years. Even after the practice of the federal courts was brought into harmony with that of the state courts, five years elapsed before debt imprisonment was done away with in the District, where congress had exclusive legislation. Public sentiment on this subject in the District, as was the case in some of the states, was apparently more advanced than the national legislature. Undoubtedly, in consequence of a public demand, the circuit court at the October term in 1823, a few months after congress had exempted men over seventy years of age and all women from the operations of the debtor law, enlarged the prison bounds in both counties. The narrow oblong about Judiciary Square, to which the prison bounds had been restricted seven years before as a place "where the debtors might walk for their health in the open air," was enlarged and made the same as those of the county.[1] For as one result of the "unbounded credit," encouraged and supported by the law, "to the great injury and even ruin of many honest but improvident debtors,"[2] the cells were filled with the poorer classes. The enlargement of the prison bounds was intended to afford a chance to earn money and pay off the debts which had sent them to jail.[3] It may be concluded from the discussion of debt laws in congress that men were fearful of the future of business if even a part of the protection of the law was withdrawn from the credit system. In spite of the abuses of the law, of the filling of the prisons with the victims of spite and avarice as well as of misfortune, yet it was felt that credit could not be maintained, unless not only the property but the body of the debtor was made liable. At that time in Great Britain the system was still in operation, but in France it had been abolished by the code of Napoleon.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 4, 1825.

[2] The same, March 11, 1823.

[3] Stats., 5, 678, June 17, 1844. Eleven days after the act became a law the circuit court held that its meaning was to prohibit imprisonment for debt. Hayward and Hazelton Reports, Vol. 1, p. 191.

[4] Annals of Congress, Feb. 24, 1821, p. 1224.

[5] The same, Feb. 16, 1824, p. 483. Eight years later the effort was renewed but failed. Register of Debates, p. 2475, April 10, 1832.

---

[1] 24th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 24, Dec. 14, 1836. At this time in many parts of New England and in Michigan the prison bounds and those of the county were the same. Annals of Congress, Feb. 16, 1824, p. 483.

[2] Annals of Congress, Feb. 24, 1821, p. 1224.

[3] The pitiful amounts for which men were sent to prison seem incredible to this age. In 1825 a man remained in jail twenty-five days for a debt of $3.41, while another served thirteen days for a debt of $1.56. For a debt of 56 cents a man in 1831 remained twelve months in the prison bounds. Report giving number of persons imprisoned for debt in Washington County from 1820 to 1834. 24th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 24, Dec. 14, 1836.

The power of congress as to the abolition of imprisonment for debt in the District was national in its scope. It was not restricted, as was the case with the abolition of slavery in the District, by the current doctrine of state rights. At least in every federal judicial district in every state an act of congress would apply to the United States courts.

But if the purpose of the fierce struggle for the abolition of slavery in the District had been accomplished, not a single slave owned outside of its limits would have been set free. At the same time, even before the District became the storm centre of the slavery agitation, because it was the seat of government and subject to the exclusive legislation of congress, it was recognized as a place to which the eyes of the Nation turned and therefore a vantage-point for a campaign of education. This motive was influential in securing a penitentiary system for the District. During the years preceding the passage of this measure in 1826, owing, it was stated, to the indefatigable exertions of Rev. Dr. Louis Dwight of Massachusetts, secretary of the Prison Discipline Society, "we are mainly indebted for the erection of the District penitentiary."[1] Dr. Dwight also interested himself in the condition of the jail, which he found, as others had done years before, radically defective in its plan and so totally unfit that it ought, he declared, to be razed to the ground. Apparently Dr. Dwight told his story of what he had seen at the jail to the house District committee, and then one of the members, Alexander Thomson of Pennsylvania, made a personal inspection, and his account of the overcrowded, insanitary building, as told on the floor of the house, was not lacking in graphic touches or in detail.[2] Although Mr. Thomson's congressional career was limited to but one term, "the exertions which he made to examine the conditions of our prisons, to procure their improvement and the amelioration of the penal code" made such a deep impression on the minds of citizens of Washington that "in order to commemorate these services" they had his portrait painted and hung it in the city hall.[1] The jail in Alexandria, Mr. Thomson had been told, was a private dwelling in no way fitted for the purposes of a prison. In the course of a few weeks after these disclosures congress not only provided for a penitentiary to be built in Washington, but also for a jail in Alexandria. The date — 1826 — of this law, making practically the first appropriation of public money to be expended on the south side of the Potomac, is within a few weeks of a quarter of a century after the passage of the act by which congress assumed the jurisdiction of the District.[2]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 29, 1836.

[2] Annals of Congress, March 1, 1826, p. 1475.

The establishment of the penitentiary relieved the crowded condition of the Washington jail, while an appropriation was made of half the amount devoted to the building of a jail in Alexandria, for the purpose of making the Washington jail suitable and healthy.[3] The Washington jail thus improved did service for thirteen years, when an entirely new structure was erected by congress in another part of Judiciary Square at the corner of 4th and G streets.[4] In spite of the relief given to the business of the circuit court by enlarging the jurisdiction of the magistrates, in spite of the addition of the penitentiary and the restriction of debt imprisonment, the judicial coat provided in 1801 for the population of the District of 14,000 was found in 1830 to chafe and bind a community of 40,000. As stated in a carefully prepared and able report by the house District committee in that year,[1] not only were the laws severe, designed as they had been for a previous age, but the people suffered hardships because by reason of the organization and proceedings of the circuit court interminable delays and needless expense and injustice were caused. As the result of the large number of justices of the peace, the committee stated, litigation was increased and the poor oppressed. Merely from the standpoint of the state of the laws the committee reached the conclusion that government by congress had been a failure. While quite ready either to recommend the return of the territory to the states or to provide a local legislature if the one was constitutional or the other practicable, the committee contented itself with recommending the appointment of a commission to prepare and report to congress a code of laws. Acting upon this report congress appointed a joint committee, and the latter reported to the next congress "a system of civil and criminal law for the District of Columbia and for the organization of the courts therein."[2] An edition of 600 copies was ordered printed, and towards the close of the next congress an effort was made to secure action, but without result,[3] and another interval of twenty years elapsed before an attempt was again made to secure a code for the District.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 4, 1826. In the issue of May 15 is the address of the committee of citizens asking Mr. Thomson to sit for his portrait, and his reply.

[2] The authority given by congress (Stats., 3, 318 and 415, April 27, 1816 and April 3, 1818) to the levy court of Alexandria County to levy a tax to defray the cost of erecting a jail and a court-house was not exercised. In 1819 congress voted a small sum of money for the purchase or erection of a custom-house in Alexandria.

[3] U. S. Law, May 20, 1826.

[4] The new building was built of brick, stuccoed, 100 feet front, 50 feet deep and 40 feet high, with the third story surmounted by a belfry. In one section were the cells for criminals separated from the outer wall by a passageway, while in another section were the debtors' cells. (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 3, 1839.) A brick wall surrounded the building. Its cost was about $38,000. The old jail erected in 1802 was a two-story brick building with a length of 100 feet, a width of 25 feet and cost about $12,000.

While congress did not adopt a code, yet, no doubt in consequence of the strong arraignment in the report of 1830 of the state of the laws, the following spring an act was passed which modernized the practice of the criminal law. All capital crimes were abolished except murder, treason and piracy and in the case of slaves, rape.[1] Thus after a period of thirty years the severity of the old English and colonial criminal laws was mitigated, a tardy response to the needs of that changing period. For the first time congress in this law laid its restraining hand upon the evil of gambling. Three years before Jackson became president the increase in the number of public establishments where gaming was carried on, and the profits flowing from the business, had rendered the city ordinance of 1809, imposing a small fine, of no effect. For of what consequence was the paying out of such small sums of money to those daily gathering in great ones?[2] What was intended to be a more stringent ordinance was enacted by the city council in the winter of 1829–1830, which increased the fine and required a bond, the latter on penalty of a workhouse sentence.[3] Then as a further aid in the work congress the next year made keeping a gambling place a penitentiary offence, and thereafter the business was conducted less openly, although it continued to be so prevalent that it was said, "there is no city in which gambling is carried to a greater extent than in the metropolis of the country."[4] Some eight years after the reform, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say the softening of the harshness of the criminal law, the pressure on the circuit court was relieved by the creation of a criminal court.[5] As was the case with the circuit court two terms were held each year in each county. The clerk of the circuit court served the new court. The salary of the judge was $500 less than that of the assistant judges of the circuit court. Upon the new court fell all the criminal business of the District which had "not infrequently occupied four, five and six weeks of the circuit court, to the great hindrance and delay of the civil business."[1] The first judge, Thomas F. Mason, lived only six months after receiving the appointment. He presided over but one term of the court, that held in December, 1838.[2] He was succeeded by James Dunlop, a native of Georgetown and a grandson of Robert Peter, one of the large landowners when the city was laid out. Mr. Dunlop had studied law in the office of Francis Scott Key, and then became associated with him in the practice of the law. When he came to the bench, he found his former preceptor and partner filling the office of district attorney.

---

[1] 21st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 269, March 3, 1830.

[2] Report, 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 96, Feb. 14, 1833. The code, 22d Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 85, Feb. 28, 1833. Also an edition in two volumes. Washington, D. Green, 1833. The penal code, code of criminal procedure and code of prison discipline were taken from the work of Edward Livingston, prepared for Louisiana in 1826, but not directly accepted by the legislature of that state. Efforts to obtain a Code of Laws. W. S. Cox. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 3, p. 119.

[3] Register of Debates, Feb. 23, 1835, p. 456.

---

[1] U. S. Law, March 2, 1831.

[2] *U. S. Telegraph*, Jan. 7, 1829.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 5, 1829; Ordinance, Jan. 12, 1830.

[4] The same, Nov. 12, 1833; also Perley's Reminiscences, Vol. 1, p. 60.

[5] Stats., 5, 306, July 7, 1838.

No place had been provided for the sittings of the court, and so for a decade it shared with the circuit court the use of the court-room on the east side of the principal south entrance of the city hall. When the term of either court was prolonged so as to run into that of the other, then the grand jury room was utilized.[3] Finally, however, relief came when congress in 1849 provided money to complete the city hall building, stipulating, however, as a condition, "that room enough be set apart for the use of the said United States in the District of Columbia."[4] At once the city council assigned for the use of the criminal court the common council chamber which was on the west side of the principal entrance, but not to "interfere with the meeting of the common council."[5]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 6, 1838.

[2] The same, Dec. 24, 1838.

[3] The same, Jan. 6, Nov. 23, 1840.

[4] Stats., 9, 362, March 3, 1849.

[5] Ordinance, May 1, 1849. *Intelligencer*, May 7, 1849.

CHAPTER V

AN AMBITIOUS CIVIC SPIRIT

To make Washington in reality what it was in name, worthy to be the capital city of a great nation, was not in the minds of public-spirited citizens a mere phrase. It was a working policy. The narrow circumstances of the municipality, while a constant obstacle, were neither insuperable nor were allowed to obscure this ideal. The importance of keeping within the available income of the town was no doubt realized, although not always regarded. The entire situation would have been simpler if congress had from the outset recognized in a definite, fixed policy its relations, if not to the city as a federal seat, at least as a large property holder to its maintenance and improvement. As can be readily understood in a town planned on such a generous and unprecedented scale, the main burden of municipal expense was the improvement of the streets. Largely because of such expenditures the means of the corporation had never been equal to the wants.[1] The good-will of the members of the national legislature was naturally considered a valuable asset. It was regarded as specially important that their temporary residence should be made as agreeable as possible, and also that those drawn to the place because it was the national centre might be influenced to make Washington their permanent home. Such motives supply an explanation for much that was relatively ambitious in civic conditions for a town of the size of Washington. It was an unusual municipal policy for that day to aim to make the city convenient and desirable as a place of residence, as in all other towns the promotion of commerce and trade was the main consideration.

---

[1] Message of the mayor. Jour. Bd. of Alder., Vol. 5, Oct. 5, 1818.

But municipal expenditures of the extent that found favor with the city fathers were beyond the usual revenues, and so the debt of the city began to roll up.

As appropriations for streets continued to be the largest item in the annual city budget, the policy pursued can be traced not alone in the acts of the city council making appropriations for this purpose, but also in the provisions for the interest on the city debt. By the ordinance of Nov. 3, 1814, $1300 was voted to pay interest charges, and six years later this item had grown to $3000, an increase in six years in the principal of the debt from $21,000 to $50,000, a per capita, indebtedness of $3.77.

The earlier method of providing for deficiencies in the current revenues, at first in anticipation of delayed tax payments by means of loans from banks, was superseded in 1818, when the existing debt was funded by an issue of corporation stock, and future demands were met by a further issue. While the amount of street work increased, its character remained unchanged. The improvements were completed when the line of the thoroughfares was cleared and graded and the surface in whole or in part covered with gravel. The first third of the century passed before any change was made, and then macadam was used, but only where congress improved Pennsylvania Avenue between the capitol and the president's house. No sidewalks of brick were laid except by an assessment on the abutting property. While the municipality was spending money on the streets within the city, bridges and turnpikes were being provided by private enterprise to make the city accessible from the surrounding country. A year after the armed force of the enemy left the city the three bridges that had been destroyed were replaced.[1] As the two bridges over the Eastern Branch had been burned by order of the American military authorities and not by the invader, their loss was regarded as a proper charge on the public, and in the spring of 1815 congress passed bills of relief. Shortly after the money became available the Anacostia or upper bridge, owned by Dr. Thomas

[1] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 26, 1815.

Ewell, was ready for use.[1] The Eastern Branch or Lower Bridge was rebuilt during 1815. At the next session of congress the Washington Bridge Co. was reimbursed in part for the loss of the Long Bridge, as it was shown that the southern portion had been set on fire by the American forces, while the match was applied at the other end by the British.[2] The new structure had hardly come into use when congress was asked to authorize the Navy Yard Bridge Co. to span with a bridge the Eastern Branch at the foot of 11th Street east.[3] The directors of the Eastern Branch Bridge a short distance to the east protested, but in vain.[4] The cost of the new structure was small as compared with what had been expended on the Long Bridge and the Chain Bridge. But the narrowness of the waters spanned as well as the freedom from the devastating effects of the great freshets of the Potomac served to lessen the original cost as well as the maintenance charge. The standing of the Chain Bridge as a dividend earner was set forth in a memorial to congress.[5] The tolls received have not averaged, it was stated, one per cent on the capital of $81,000, and the return at that time was but 2¼ per cent. The company proposed, if the privilege of a lottery for the amount expended was granted to it, to assign the bridge to the levy court and make it free. It was claimed the company had as much right to such a privilege as the corporation of Georgetown that was then asking for a lottery in order to erect a free bridge at or near the Three Sisters.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 6, 1815. The structure was commonly called Ewell's Bridge. (The same, Dec. 20, 1822.) It was purchased by William Benning. (The same, Feb. 4, 1825.)

[2] American State Papers. Claims, p. 446.

[3] Annals of Congress, Feb. 11, 1818, p. 878.

[4] The same, p. 1380. The charter was granted Feb. 14, 1819, to William Prout, William Marbury, Samuel N. Smallwood, Timothy Winn and Adam Lindsay. The work was begun July 4 and the bridge was in use by the following October, although not entirely completed. For $18,000 a structure, 1600 feet long and 25 feet wide, was built of wood resting on piles, with a draw over the channel which was 24 feet deep at that point, thus "affording an easy passage for vessels navigating the Eastern Branch." (*City of Washington Gazette*, Oct. 4, 1819.) A little more than a decade previous vessels are said to have ascended the stream as far as Bladensburg. (*Intelligencer*, June 8, 1807. Advt. of sale of hotel of Wm. Ross.)

[5] 19th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 86, May 1, 1826.

Five years before the corporation of Georgetown had under consideration a plan for erecting a free bridge to Analostan Island. It was to be financed, according to one plan, by private subscriptions and also by a tax of one per cent for five years on the property in the town.[1] This Georgetown scheme prompted the suggestion of the editor of the *Intelligencer* that, by means of a similar plan, the Long Bridge be purchased and made free. As it turned out the object of these suggestions was not attained until the next decade and then not until congress by appropriations bought out the rights of all the bridge companies and made them free. It may be concluded from the way the various turnpike road enterprises dragged along that the financial resources of the citizens were limited. At the period of the war only two of the five highways proposed to be built had been finished. Both began at the Virginia end of the Long Bridge, one leading to Alexandria and the other known as the Columbia Road to the west and north, making a connection with the Little River pike from Alexandria through Fairfax to Snicker's Gap. It was not until the year 1820 that the road through Bladensburg to Baltimore was completed.[2] Three years later and eight years after the charter had been obtained the turnpike connecting Georgetown and Rockville was finished. Within three years the company was able to begin the payment of a six per cent dividend.[3] In the course of eleven years after beginning operations the earnings of the Washington and Baltimore pike reached a dividend basis.[4]

An improved road directly connecting the city with the country to the north was not secured until 1829. Then one was built from the urban bounds at the head of 7th Street to the District line, the result of years of effort that, however, fell short of the original purpose, which was to extend the road to Rockville.[1] By the year 1830 at all the principal approaches to the city by road or bridges that familiar figure of the period, the toll-gatherer, stopped the traveller and exacted a charge. It was a tribute that no doubt was cheerfully paid by those who recalled the contrast between conditions then and as they had been. For it was said when the Washington-Baltimore road was nearly completed that the time of travel between the two places was reduced from twelve and fifteen hours to about six.[2] The opening of what came to be called the 7th Street pike was looked upon no doubt as a great public benefit. For if one wished to go by a good road into the country north of the city, the way was not limited, as had been the case, to passing through the streets of Georgetown "and up the everlasting hills above it."[3] How long this satisfaction over the improvement in the facilities of travel lasted is not fully recorded, but from the style of road building that was carried out on the Georgetown and Rockville pike it does not seem probable it could have lasted any length of time, unless the companies spent yearly a good deal of money. The line of the Georgetown Pike, and it is probable the same plan was followed in building the other District roads, was made as straight as possible, the surface levelled and covered with gravel a few inches thick at a cost of $2500 per mile.[4] The great Baltimore and Frederick Pike was covered with broken stone from ten to twelve inches in depth and cost about $8000 per mile.[5] But that was the so-called Baltimore Bank Road, built by the state banks as a bonus for their charters, while in the District such enterprises were entirely dependent on individual subscriptions. It was from this latter source the money was secured that built the road from Georgetown to Rockville, and when a spur of the Bank Road was started south from Frederick with a bridge across the Monocacy, then congress was asked to supply the money that would complete the gap of twenty-one miles in the road that was planned to connect Georgetown with Frederick.[1] In the course of the debate in the house it was said a larger sum than the one asked for had been spent in the mere survey and location for a proposed extension of the Cumberland Road from Cumberland to Washington. Owing to the bad state of the roads, travellers having Washington as a destination were frequently obliged to go around by Baltimore. The western trade was entirely diverted to Baltimore. In fact it was stated that Maryland had withdrawn further aid from the proposed connection of the Bank Road with Rockville and left it in an incomplete state because of the apprehension of loss to Baltimore trade, a policy that was developed more fully when the struggle began between the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal over the right of way.

---

[1] *Georgetown Messenger*. Reprinted in the *Intelligencer*, Sept. 18, 1820.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 4, 1820.

[3] Statement of Nathan Lufborough, president of the Washington Turnpike Co. *Intelligencer*, Feb. 8, 1826; also *Intelligencer*, Sept. 4, 1820.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 21, 1831.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 29, 1829. Announcement by the Rockville and Washington Turnpike Co. of the erection of gates and that tolls would be collected.

[2] The same, March 29, 1819. The next year the road was completed. (*Intelligencer*, Sept. 4, 1820.) Then it was said the time between the towns was 5 or 6 hours in the summer and 6 or 7 in the winter.

[3] The same, Oct. 8, 1818.

[4] The same, Sept. 4, 1820.

[5] American State Papers, Miscella., Vol. 1, p. 938.

In the next congress, the members, who had probably become tired of being stalled on the road from Frederick with the alternative of going around by Baltimore undismayed by the veto at the last session of a similar measure, the Maysville turnpike bill, voted to subscribe for the stock. The bill, however, was vetoed by President Jackson on the ground that it was a local not a national improvement.[2] Besides the roads the new agency of steam was being used with success on the broad bosom of the Potomac. In two years following the day in June, 1815, when a steamboat line was established between the city and Aquia Creek, three steamboats and a horse boat[3] were being run on the river. For while the transfer of the travel on the great highway between Washington and Fredericksburg, Va., and the south to the river required the service of one steamboat, the traffic between the three District towns gave employment to three.[1] In the summer of 1818, three years after the steamboat *Washington* began its trips to Aquia Creek, a more ambitious scheme was successfully launched. Citizens of Alexandria and Norfolk organized a company and put on a weekly steamboat service between the two towns.[2] It thus came about, in six years after the war, that while neither of the proposed Rockville turnpike roads had been built and there was a gap of fifty miles between that place and the Frederick pike, still the improvement in the means of communication to the north over the Baltimore pike and to the south, where steam had been substituted for stages for some forty miles, was such that a contemporary writer declared that "the most enthusiastic dreamer could not twenty years ago have anticipated a rapidity of conveyance which would have been thought little less than magical."[3] Seven years after this magical transformation, John Quincy Adams, the president of the United States, had not heard of his father's death prior to his departure from Washington on the 9th of July, the fifth day after the venerable ex-president breathed his last. On the morning of the day of the funeral services in Quincy, Mass., Mr. Adams left Washington in his own carriage drawn by four horses. At Baltimore he received the intelligence of his father's death which occurred on the 4th inst. He left Baltimore at 5 o'clock that afternoon by steamboat for Frenchtown at the head of Chesapeake Bay, and thence

---

[1] Register of Debates, p. 211, Jan. 14, 1829. A subscription to 5000 shares at $20 per share was asked, which was stated to be about one-half of what had been spent on the other two sections.

[2] Annals of Congress, Dec. 31, 1830, p. 7.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 23, 1817. As the name implies, the motive power was furnished by horses that walked in a circle on the deck, turning a crank. This kind of boat first came into use on the New York

---

ferries in 1814. (McMaster, Vol. 4, p. 403.) They were mainly used as freight boats and cost less to operate than steamboats as no royalty was paid. Aquia is the modern form for Acquia.

[1] Two trips were made daily between Alexandria and Washington and Georgetown. As rates for annual, semi-annual and quarterly tickets are quoted (*Intelligencer*, Feb. 17, 1818) it is evident commuters used the line. The fare for a single passage was 50 cents.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 15, 1818, and March 29, 1819. Seven years later it was announced the boat left Washington at 4 P.M. and reached Norfolk the following afternoon. Fare, $6.

[3] The same, March 29, 1819.

by stage to New Castle, Del., and thence by boat to Philadelphia, where he arrived at nine o'clock the next morning. He travelled by stage to New Brunswick and thence by steamboat to New York, arriving there some forty-five hours after leaving the national capital.[1] This was not only rapid travelling as compared with a few years before, but steam had done more than to conquer space, as the fare between Washington and New York had fallen from $24 to $9.[2] The increase in the business had resulted in competition, which had gone the length of a rate war between rival stage lines between Washington and Baltimore, reducing the fare from $2 to $1.[3] Travel by steamboat was of comparatively slow growth, as the engines were crude and public opinion not entirely satisfied as to safety. It was not until seven years after the Aquia Creek line became a part of the great post-road between the north and the south that a landing-place exclusively for the steamboat line was provided. Then a wharf was built at the foot of 14th Street adjoining and to the south of the bridge.[4] Four years later the steamboat wharf became such a centre that a hotel was opened in the vicinity especially for the accommodation of travellers.[5]

The work on the Washington City Canal, suspended during the season of 1814, owing to the invasion of the city, was resumed the next year, and by the fall its completion was announced. This event five years after the first spadeful of earth was thrown out of the proposed trench was formally observed. A barge was provided for the directors of the company, members of the city council and prominent citizens, while, closely following, a similar vessel carried the Marine Band. The two boats left the bridge at 12th Street, northwest, and in a half hour reached the Eastern Branch, a distance of some two miles.[6] The depth of water, according to the measurements made on this occasion, averaged four and in no part less than three feet, thus complying, the company held, with the charter requirements. In the contemporary accounts the undertaking was described as "bold and arduous," [1] but mainly because of the difficulty in securing adequate funds. In fact the canal was not completely finished, although $85,300 had been spent, when it was formally declared that the work done conformed to the charter requirements.[2] Two years later rates of tolls and wharfage were established. They had hardly been in force two months when a public outcry arose. It was claimed the rates were excessive and had resulted in raising the price of the citizens' supply of firewood. An indignant citizen, who was the medium for venting the feelings of his fellows, asserted that not only were the rates excessive, but the company had no right to make any charge at all, as it had not complied with the charter in the requirement as to the depth of the water.[3] For, he added, the canal has three feet of water only at high tide, while at low tide the muddy bottom is exposed. To this "Stockholder" [4] made prompt reply and rather naïvely, if with a touch of modernism, stated that an opinion of a lawyer assures the company that if the canal "is navigable at high water, the requisites of the law are complied with." On the other hand, it was brought out that now, after the lapse of nine years, the company had not paid a dividend and the stock with a par value of $100 had sold at $30. Already it was recognized, as the event proved, that the section of the canal from the Centre Market, where there was a lock, to the Potomac was the most important, for at that time one-third of the inhabitants of the city resided between the president's house and the capitol.[5] It was urged that the canal be deepened to at least eight feet between those points. But the resources of the company were exhausted, and what revenue was collected from the section west of the market, which alone was in use, was not sufficient to accomplish what was necessary.[1] But the waterway in the middle section soon choked up with deposits, the effect, as recognized in later years, of the meeting of the tides from the Eastern Branch and from the Potomac, which also retained the washings from the streets and sewers.[2] The section south of Centre Market became impassable. Only by dredging could vessels of light draught come up from the Potomac to the basin at 10th Street.[3]

---

[1] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 7, p. 126, July 9, 1826.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 6, 1826.

[3] The same, March 1, 1826.

[4] The same, Jan. 10, 1825. Sessford's statement. Also Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 278; *Intelligencer*, Oct. 24, 1835.

[5] The same, Aug. 10, 1829. The Steamboat Hotel, as it was called by the proprietor, Wm. Wood, was in a new three-story brick house at the corner of 11th and Water streets.

[6] The same, Oct. 27 and Nov. 22, 1815.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 27, 1815.

[2] Report of President and Directors of the Company. 14th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc., Jan. 31, 1817.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 2, 1817.

[4] The same, Sept. 6, 1817.

[5] The same, Sept. 15, 1817, and March 13, 1818. There was also a basin on the north side between 10th and 12th streets.

So unsatisfactory was its state, which it was believed then could be corrected, that as early as 1817–1818 the city council began to discuss the question of its purchase by the city.[4] More than ten years passed before the transfer was made. By that time, however, the situation had changed. The canal had become an important factor in large plans for the development of the trade and commerce of the city. It was to be not merely a local artery of commerce, useful mainly to lessen the transportation charges on articles of daily and household need, but a terminus of the great waterway that was to bring the flour of the west and the coal of the Maryland mountains through the city to deep-water navigation on the Eastern Branch. For after an agitation of some five years, appealing to the interests and to the judgment of the people of three states and especially of the District and congress, with the ardent hope of getting the latter committed to the American system, as it was called, of internal improvements, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co. had been organized in 1828.

---

[1] In addition to firewood for the local market, marble and stone used in the erection of the public buildings as well as building material in general were brought into the city via the canal. *Intelligencer*, July 1, 1817.

[2] Jour. 64th Coun., p. 591. Report of Benjamin Severson, engineer of the canal improvement. April 22, 1867.

[3] As showing the unwalled state of the canal at that period it is stated the tide ebbed and flowed as far north as C Street between 9th and 12th streets within a block of Pennsylvania Avenue. Ordinance, June 28, 1816.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 15, 1830.

For the first time the purely local affairs of the District were involved in a contest over a great national question. As congress made a stock subscription of a million dollars to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co., and also gave authority to the three towns to subscribe to an aggregate of a million and a half of the stock, it appeared that the advocates of national aid and coöperation in such enterprises had won a substantial victory. In addition to the federal money contribution, which was taken to include the subscription of the three towns because of the virtual guarantee of this subscription by the government, a survey of the proposed route was provided for at government expense, which led to the organization of the United States Board of Improvement, with General S. Bernard, the chief of the corps of United States engineers, at its head. To the great disappointment of those interested in such a policy no further federal aid was given, and as in the only other instance of such legislation, the National Pike, the federal treasury was closed after the early appropriations.

The western canal enterprise was formally inaugurated on the 4th of July, 1828, when John Quincy Adams, the president of the United States, in the presence of a great throng including cabinet officers, members of the diplomatic corps and a few members of congress, that body not being in session, dug the first spade of earth at the beginning of the proposed work a short distance north of the District line above the Little Falls Bridge.[1] As the canal was to begin at tide-water navigation, which was below the Little Falls, the interval between that point and the new work was provided for by making use of a section of the old Potomac canal.[2] But while the citizens of Washington joined in the exercises of what was most earnestly believed to be a memorable occasion in the history of the District, yet they were not satisfied to have the canal begin so far from the city. They wanted it to start, not at tide-water or boat navigation as proposed, but at the head of ship navigation in the Eastern Branch. The harmony that had prevailed a few days before at the formal inauguration of the work gave place to controversy. Georgetown naturally was unwilling to surrender the advantages of having practically the terminus of the canal, but tactfully based her opposition to placing the burden of the additional cost on the canal company. The only alternative suggested was the impossible one, that the city of Washington should do the work at its own cost.[1] Alexandria on certain conditions favored the extension.[2] But Washington secured the coöperation of Richard Rush, who as secretary of the treasury represented the stock of the United States, and that holding, together with the city's, gave a control.[3] The directors of the company raised the same question as that of Georgetown, namely, the increased cost, and counselled delay. With an assured stock control Washington naturally favored action. The directors, yielding, called a meeting of the stock-

---

[1] Full program of the exercises, *Intelligencer*, July 4, 1828. Also account of the ceremonies in the issue of July 7.

[2] This section was available at that time, as the company that attended the opening celebration went on board steamboats at the foot of Wisconsin Avenue, steaming up the river to "above the lower termination of the Potomac canal" and then by canal boats on the old waterway to the spot designated for breaking ground. *Intelligencer*, July 7, 1828.

---

[1] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 8, p. 73, July 31, 1828.

[2] Proceedings of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co., and the corporations of Washington, Georgetown and Alexandria. Washington, 1828. The Georgetown proceedings are not in this pamphlet because, as stated in a note, "not having been received."

[3] When the work on the canal was begun in 1828, the subscriptions to the stock were:—

United States	$1,000,000
Washington	1,000,000
Maryland	500,000
Alexandria	250,000
Georgetown	250,000
Shepherdstown	2,000
Individuals	607,400
Total to the year 1837	$3,609,400

The individual subscriptions from the three towns were as follows:

Washington	$233,600
Georgetown	229,700
Alexandria	47,300
	$509,600

From the report to stockholders, pp. 39 and 151. Frederick, 1851.

holders, and the plan prepared by the city council of Washington was adopted, which provided that the canal company should make the extension.

Instead of stopping below the Little Falls, the canal was continued to Georgetown and thence through that town, a short distance north of Water Street parallel with the Potomac, to a basin in Rock Creek between L and M streets. Starting again on the opposite side of that stream, about at the foot of I Street, the canal continued to 27th and G streets, and following slightly to the east the line of 27th to upper Water Street, and thence substantially along the line of B Street to 17th Street.[1] The dominance of Washington in the affairs of the canal at the beginning, due to the coöperation of the United States, was pronounced. The headquarters of the company were located in the city.[2] This extension of the canal added a half million to its cost, and besides meant an additional outlay on the part of both Washington and Alexandria. For Washington was required to provide a basin at the proposed terminus at 17th Street into which the boats from the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal were to be let by a lock and thence into the city canal.[3] A larger item of expense, due to the financial condition of the city canal company, was the necessity of purchasing that waterway so that it could be widened and deepened and become the real terminus of the canal at ship navigation on the Eastern Branch. A still greater outlay was called for from Alexandria, but it was felt to be "justified by the strictest laws of necessity and self-protection."[1] For the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, instead of ending some eight miles above Alexandria, was to be brought by the enterprise of its citizens directly to its doors through an aqueduct stretching across the river and by a waterway along the Virginia shore to the municipal limits with an outlet lock into the river.

---

[1] Chart of the head of navigation of the Potomac River. R. W. Burgess, C. E., 1857. Also U. S. *vs.* M. F. Morris *et al.* Testimony, Appendix, Part 2, p. 128.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 28, 1828. The company accepted the offer of the corporation of Washington of office rooms in the second story of the west wing of the city hall. In 1840 the offices were removed to Frederick, Md., and in 1851 were brought to Washington and eventually established in Georgetown, the present headquarters of the company.

[3] A stone house built by the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co. in 1837 for the lock-keeper is now used by the police of Potomac Park, standing as it does at the 17th Street entrance. *Intelligencer*, May 22, 1837.

However, it was recognized from the outset that the undertaking was too large for a community the size of Alexandria, in view especially of its subscription of a quarter of a million to the greater project. So it was agreed that the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co. would erect at its own expense the aqueduct pier on the north side of the river and recommend to congress that Alexandria be aided especially in building the aqueduct.

Less than three years after this arrangement was made, the city of Washington, in addition to an appropriation from congress, borrowed money, bought the city canal and then went deeper into debt to widen it.[2] Alexandria built its canal through the medium of the Alexandria Canal Co. chartered by congress, while the improvement of the municipally owned canal of Washington was intrusted by the city council to a commission. In both cases the treasuries and credits of the two cities furnished the largest proportion of the money that was expended on what proved to be unprofitable and to a large extent useless undertakings.

The Washington Canal cost $310,000, of which $150,000 was appropriated by congress,[3] while a million and a quarter of dollars was spent on the connection to Alexandria.[4] The largeness of these sums, as compared with the resources of the communities,[5] makes it possible to realize to some extent the force of current opinion of the day in regard to the importance and value of facilities for commerce and trade. Such was the intensity of public interest that when the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal bill was pending in congress to allow the District cities the privilege of tripling and of doubling the municipal debts which had taken nearly a third of a century to accumulate, public notice was given by the mayor of Washington that he would proclaim the joyful news of the passage of the bill by having a flag hoisted on the city hall.[1] As soon as the signal was given, cannon thundered a salute in Washington and also in Georgetown.[2] A further suggestion of the state of the public mind in relation to these enterprises was the acceptance, as the basis of a serious business proposition, of estimates of cost absurdly low as compared with the actual outlay. In this respect the great work of building the western canal was managed no better.[3] In the case of the Alexandria Canal a source of error in the estimates was brought to light soon after the commencement of the work, when it was found that a wooden trough capable of bearing the computed weight of the canal and stretching over 1500 feet of water could not be supported on wooden pilings exposed to the action of the river, which even at that point had hardly quieted down from its long and rapid rush down through the valley of the Potomac.[4] On the contrary Captain William Turnbull, of the topographical bureau of the war department, who was placed by the company in charge of building the aqueduct, decided that masonry piers built on bed-rock were essential.

---

[1] Memorial of the corporate authorities of Alexandria. 24th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 53, Jan. 13, 1836.

[2] City Ordinance, Jan. 3, 1831.

[3] Financial statement. In Laws, 1837. Also Stat. 4. 651, March 2, 1833.

[4] Annual report of the Alexandria Canal Co. Alexandria, 1849. Congress appropriated $400,000 and the city of Alexandria contributed nearly the entire balance.

[5] Up to the year 1829 the debt of Washington was $361,826 or $19 per capita, that of Georgetown $155,149 or $18 per capita, and that of Alexandria $277,776 or $27 per capita.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 27, 1828.

[2] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 8, p. 7.

[3] The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal was capitalized at $6,000,000, while the estimate of cost of the work from Georgetown to Cumberland at a depth of either four or five feet varied from a little over a million to eight millions of dollars. Report to stockholders, 1851, pp. 31 to 34. Up to the year 1850, when the canal was opened at a depth of six feet, $11,071,176 had been spent on construction.

The Washington Canal, on which it was proposed at the outset to spend $80,000, cost $310,000, while the Alexandria Canal Co., capitalized at $250,000, with the right to increase the capital stock, and which was computed to cost about $300,000, cost $1,250,000. 22d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 419, March 30, 1832.

[4] 23d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 498, May 30, 1834.

While engaged in this work, which still stands and as a bridge is one of the busy highways across the Potomac, Captain Turnbull stated that with the exception of the bridge over the Schuylkill at Philadelphia there was no other instance in this country of a structure founded upon rock at so great a depth.[1] However, the economic pressure of the times, for better transportation facilities and the apparent assured prospects of profits in such ventures as was demonstrated by the financial success of the Erie Canal that was opened in 1825, led to a repetition in the District on a larger proportionate scale of what was being done throughout the country in the use of public money. The District towns were encouraged by congress to go into the grand scheme that was to pour the golden results of the western trade into the District coffers. Congress also helped along the subsidiary lines that were to distribute this flood among the three towns. At the same time there were not lacking voices both in and out of congress, protesting against the proposed expenditure.

In the debate in the house on the bill granting aid to the Alexandria Canal Co. one of the speakers characterized it "as a wild scheme to make a canal from Georgetown to Alexandria when Nature had made the best canal." [2] While the city canal purchase bill was pending in the Washington city council, meetings of citizens were held in several of the wards.[3] It was then pointed out that the city revenues were less than its expenditures, and further that the principal of the loan that Washington, in common with the other two towns, had been obliged to make, in order to meet its subscription for the stock of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co., had been obtained in Holland at a discount of 15 per cent,[4] and was being used to pay the interest. Apparently recognizing the hopelessness of opposition, a majority report presented at a meeting of citizens living in the ward between 10th and 15th streets accounted for what was evidently regarded as recklessness in the city government by the circumstance that wealth and numbers in the western wards, while greatly in excess of the eastern wards, yet under the existing system of equal representation of the wards in the city council neither numbers nor property wielded a control in city affairs.

---

[1] 25th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 459, July 2, 1838.

[2] Register of Debates, p. 790, Dec. 15, 1834.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 2, 15 and 17, 1830.

[4] Letter and accompanying documents from Hon. Richard Rush respecting the loan negotiated by him. Washington, 1830.

In the course of six years the city canal was completed.[1] At that time the mayor stated in his annual message that vessels drawing nearly six feet have frequently entered from the Potomac, and one drawing seven feet from the Eastern Branch. But in spite of that condition, which unfortunately was not a permanent one, and the securing of the sides of the canal by lining them with stone so as to resist the wash of the steamboats that were expected to crowd the new waterway, it was a failure. Business was lacking, but even if that had come, the canal was useless. This was not due to the strange oversight in not providing draws in the bridges at 12th and 14th streets and other defects of canal building, but rather to the persistency with which deposits formed in the canal and piled up bars at the mouth.[2] Five years after President Adams in 1828 had thrown out the first spadeful of earth, the section of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal was completed from the Georgetown basin to 17th Street, and the upper portion was open nearly to Harper's Ferry.[3] Then it seemed as if the city was to get the much-hoped-for increase in its business, even if dividends on its canal stock were still lacking. For limestone was brought down the river and kilns were built near the Georgetown basin, but on the Washington side, and lime became a home product.[4] A line of passenger boats had been running on the canal ever since 1831 when the canal was opened as far as Seneca,[1] but that service began and ended at Georgetown. The expectation of the public that had looked on the canal as a revenue producer was directed to the time when the coal mines would be reached and canal vessels loaded with lumber and coal, and other articles of use and of commerce would be brought directly from the region of the Blue Ridge Mountains as well as from the Ohio valley into the heart of the city. Already, however, it was decided that the Cumberland coal would not form the sole supply of that sort; for the new fuel, anthracite coal from the coal mines of Pennsylvania, that had been since 1825 coming into general use in the large cities of the country, had been brought to Washington and was replacing wood.[2] Alexandria had other than engineering difficulties in building its canal, for a year after the formal ceremonies were held inaugurating that work [3] the people of Georgetown rose up in opposition to the location of the north pier of the aqueduct.[4] Legal proceedings were begun, which in the usual course ended in a decision by the United States Supreme Court adverse to the Georgetown contention.[5] A third extension in the District of the great Cumberland waterway was one of the conditions of Maryland's coöperation in the enterprise. As outlined in a report of an army engineer sent to congress in 1828 this branch was to begin at the basin in Georgetown and pass entirely through the city of Washington to the junction of Maryland and Florida avenues. The further course was thence through Bladensburg and so on to Baltimore.[6] But, as it proved, Maryland was not interested in the canal. In fact

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 29, 1837.

[2] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, pp. 300, 303 and 312.

[3] Announcement of the opening of the canal to Harper's Ferry. *Intelligencer*, March 31, 1834.

[4] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 302. Permission to use the street space at the intersection of 27th and L streets opposite the entrance

---

of the canal into Rock Creek for the erection of kilns was given by a city ordinance of May 30, 1833.

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 3, 1831.

[2] The same, June 11, 1831. Announcement of the arrival of anthracite coal at Bradley's Wharf next to the Long Bridge, with a detailed account of how it can be used, for the benefit evidently of a public unfamiliar with that fuel.

[3] The same, July 1, 1831.

[4] Register of Debates, June 8, 1832, p. 1053.

[5] 12 Peter, 91.

[6] Report to the stockholders, 1851, p. 42.

the original plan to have the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal built by the three states of Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia and even the state of Ohio did not have the scope in its appeal that had been anticipated. For while Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania and the District towns were represented by county delegations in the two canal conventions, yet when subscriptions to the stock were invited, Maryland and the District towns were the only ones to respond, and the former but slightly. For nearly ten years the United States and the District owned the control of the stock, and then Maryland, having adopted the policy of utilizing the canal in connection with the railroad, began to supply the money that kept the canal builders at work until Cumberland was reached. From that state came more than half of the money expended on the canal.

What chilled Maryland's interest at the inception of the work, and especially that of such an important commercial centre as Baltimore, were the prospects of the new form of transportation that was then just beginning to be used, namely, the railroad. For on the same day, in 1828, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal was begun, a commencement was made in building the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, the first railroad company in America organized to carry on a general transportation business. Like the canal it was to provide a connection between the Atlantic seaboard and the Ohio, a scheme that three years before seemed so visionary to the editors of the *Intelligencer* because the railroad was such an experiment that they declared they would almost as soon think of bridging the Atlantic.[1] The railroad had a Maryland charter, and as it was to begin at Baltimore, the interests of that important centre turned to it rather than to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. In fact the route of the railroad from Point of Rocks on the Potomac, some 45 miles north of Washington, followed the same course as that of the canal. A struggle between the two companies over the right of way up the valley of the Potomac started in the courts in the spring of 1828 and did not end until four years later, when a decision was made in favor of the canal company. By a subsequent arrangement the railroad ended at Harper's Ferry until the canal was finished up to Cumberland.[1] Before this settlement of the dispute which had the effect of enlisting the aid of Maryland was reached, which would have been effective if less political in completing the canal, the railroad was built to Ellicott City, a distance of thirteen miles. Then the triumphant announcement was made that a car containing some twenty or thirty persons was drawn by a horse over this line at the rate of ten miles an hour.[2] A few months later, when the road was finished to Frederick, sixty-one miles from Baltimore, horses were still the motive power. More than three years before, when this experiment, in the opinion of many, of doubtful utility, was about to be made, those interested in the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co. had in mind the building of a lateral line to Washington. In the spring of 1828, shortly before what was called the corner-stone of the main line was laid, congress enacted a law giving assent to the entrance of a branch line into the District.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 9, 1825.

The importance of the proposed interurban road to Baltimore was pointed out in an article in the *Baltimore Gazette.*[3] At that time it was stated there are ten four-horse stages passing daily between Baltimore and Washington, besides other conveyances, so that it was calculated not less than one hundred people travel each day between the two places. With the increase that would be sure to come with more rapid and better facilities, the conclusion was reached, which no doubt was intended to prove attractive to prospective investors, that the stock will pay ten per cent from the commencement.[4] Some six years passed before the Washington Branch reached the District line,[1] and a month later, the cars, steam moved, passed through the city on their daily trips to the depot at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 2d Street, northwest.[2] The significance of the event was not overlooked. The members of the city council, of the three towns went in a special train to Bladensburg, where the visitors from Baltimore were received, and then the four trains with 1000 passengers and two bands of music proceeded in triumph to the Washington terminus. A dinner was served at Gadsby's and also at Brown's, and the occasion was one of civic rejoicing. It marked an epoch in the history of the city. The stage-coach gave way to the steam car that made the trip to Baltimore in two hours and ten minutes, cutting in half the stage-coach time. Accepting the inevitable, the stage-coach proprietors early realized their business was gone. As soon as the railroad was opened for travel to the boundary of the District arrangement was made by the stage companies to transfer their passengers at that point.[3] The stockholders of the turnpike company regarded this paralleling of their road as such a serious menace to their interests that the Maryland legislature allowed them a preference in the subscription to the stock of the railroad company.[4] The advantages of the new motive power in saving time were recognized by the public of the day, yet they chafed under the rates demanded by the railroad. At the outset the stage-coach served as a check on a monopoly. A little more than a year after the train service was begun a stage line between Washington and Baltimore was revived, and the public gladly availed itself of the lower fare.[5] For a time the railway lost even the mail contract.[1] Then apparently the competition was met by the railroad, and the stage service was withdrawn. In the course of six years another movement against current railroad fares resulted in putting on a line of stages that was well patronized by the public glad to save fifty cents on each trip.[2] As a whole the citizens of Washington indorsed the course pursued by the city authorities in their negotiations with the railroad company relative to the route within the city. According to the president of the company the authorities were friendly and liberal.[3] As will be seen, the railroad company was obliged to go to the city corporation before it could secure a right of way through the city. For as in Maryland the company had to deal with the legislature of the state as well as with the city council of Baltimore, so when legislation was needed in the District, it was found that, in addition to congress, the corporation of Washington had to be considered. The railroad company asked from the Maryland legislature aid in building its main line, and in 1833, before the road was built in the District, an appeal was made to congress for help in constructing that line.[4] At that time the railway officials had determined they wanted the terminus of the line in Washington in the vicinity of the general post-office at 7th and E streets, northwest. But this was in 1833. Two years before both congress and the city council had gone on record as favoring a terminus not farther west than 7th Street.[5] The city just then became the owner of the city canal, and no doubt the terminus east of 7th Street then in mind was the city canal basin at 6th Street, some five squares south of the post-office. In the course of the following three or four years the city spent large sums in improving the canal, and the railroad advanced the tracks of the Washington Branch through Maryland to the District bounds. Then the company asked congress to remove the limitations of the act of March 2, 1831, which confined the line of the road to the city streets. While the house District committee had this request under consideration, the city council served notice on congress by formal resolution [1] that the assent of the corporation would be given to the pending measure "provided," and that was the word used, an amendment was inserted directing that the railroad terminate on 6th Street between Missouri Avenue and the canal.

---

[1] Report to the stockholders, p. 44, 1851.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 11, 1831.

[3] Reprinted in the *Intelligencer*, June 10, 1829.

[4] *Intelligencer*, June 10, 1829. The estimate of the increase in the travel was verified, as after the first two months the president of the railroad company, in his annual report dated Oct. 1, 1835, stated that the average number of travellers was 200 per day. It was not until the close of the third year that the Washington Branch showed net earnings of $4\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. Twelfth report of the president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co., Dec. 13, 1838.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 18, 1835. The service began on Monday, July 20, 1835, with two trains each way. *Intelligencer*, July 23, 1835.

[2] The same, Aug. 24 and 26, 1835.

[3] The same, July 18, 1835. The following spring the railroad company was given the contract for carrying the mails. *Intelligencer*, April 29, 1836.

[4] History and Description of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, p. 42. William P. Smith, Baltimore, 1853.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 9, 1837.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 4, 1837. [2] The same, Nov. 24, 1843.

[3] Eighth annual report to the Baltimore and Ohio stockholders for 1834.

[4] A bill appropriating $350,000 for the District section passed the senate but failed in the house. Eighth annual report to Baltimore and Ohio stockholders.

[5] Stats. 4. 476, March 2, 1831. City Ordinance, Feb. 22, 1831.

A month later congress passed an act which specified the route of the railway within the city, but only as far west as Delaware Avenue and H Street, about half a mile north of the capitol.[2] At this point where the section of the route vital to the interests of the city began, congress handed over all authority to the city. Beyond that point the road could not be built unless its route was approved by the city authorities.

The city had been given its own way even if not in the way asked. Congress had not amended the law, but gave permission to the city to fix the route as it pleased, with no restrictive condition except one that escaped notice at the time and which proved to be all-important in locating the terminal where the city authorities wished. It forbade the passing of the road through any public reservations.

A month later the city council gave its approval of the route from Delaware Avenue and H Street in a diagonal course southwest through squares and streets to the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 2d Street, northwest, and thence across the avenue and through the northwest corner of the Botanic Garden of to-day and thence to 3d Street and along Missouri Avenue to 6th Street.[3]

---

[1] Feb. 3, 1835.

[2] Stats., 4, 757, March 3, 1835.

[3] The entire route from the bounds of the city to the canal at 6th Street, as determined in part by congress and the balance by the city authorities, is given in the *Intelligencer*, April 23, 1835. It is also delineated in a map of the city drawn by F. C. De Kraft and published by W. M. Morrison in 1840. The map is found in Pictures of Washington. George Waterston, 1840.

Four months after the city council had fixed the southern portion of the route of the railroad, the road was built, and a daily service between the two cities was begun. But the terminus was at Pennsylvania Avenue and 2d Street, for the line could not be continued as the city ordinance directed unless in violation of the law of congress. In this dilemma the advocates of the canal basin terminal proposed to the city council a method of reaching that point without encroaching upon a reservation. An ordinance was introduced authorizing the laying of tracks on Pennsylvania Avenue from 2d to 6th streets. It received the approval of the board of aldermen, but it failed in the common council.[1] A few months later the stockholders of the railroad company were informed by the president that as soon as "this difficulty is removed" the line will be extended as planned.[2] However, George Sweeney, who was a member of the board of aldermen and also the agent in the city of the railroad company, declared in a defence of his action in voting for the ordinance to authorize the use of Pennsylvania Avenue, that the company did not want that route but one north of the city hall to 7th Street. As for himself he took the course he did because he thought it would increase the business of the city-owned canal.[3] As was always the case in Washington, there was not lacking at this time the voice of the advocate of the best civic conditions. He cried out against railroad tracks on Pennsylvania Avenue as it was "the nation's highway" that ought to be free from such obstructions.[4] Another advocate of city sightliness objected to locating the depot at the canal basin, because it would be in front of the two principal hotels, Gadsby's and Brown's.[5] In his opinion a better plan would be to continue the route as laid down by congress, from Delaware Avenue west along H, K or I streets to the basin of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal in Georgetown with a lateral line down 7th Street to the post-office department. He cited the case of Pratt Street in Baltimore as showing that a street can be used both as a highway and for a railroad.[1] Whatever was done to get the consent of congress to complete the railroad route to the city canal basin did not reach the stage of a bill or a committee report, as there is no further trace of the matter in the records of congress.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 30, 1835.

[2] Ninth annual report to Baltimore and Ohio stockholders, Oct. 1, 1835.

[3] *Intelligencer*, July 23, 1835.

[4] The same, July 30, 1835.

[5] The same, Feb. 13, 1835.

It is apparent the proposed terminus at the city canal was for the freight business. For at the time the president of the railroad company informed the stockholders the route of the road would be continued across Pennsylvania Avenue as soon as the existing obstacle was removed, he also told them of the purchase of a three-story brick house at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 2d Street, where the ticket office was located. In the rear, he added, was a car house.[2] But Pennsylvania Avenue and 2d Street, even from the beginning, was evidently not considered by the railroad company as the real terminal; for when the plan of the route was agreed upon, the railroad company had already purchased from the United States the whole of Square 632 for a depot,[3] and where fifteen years later the first depot building was erected.[4]

---

[1] Four years previously the city council of Baltimore gave permission to the Baltimore and Ohio to lay tracks from its depot on Pratt Street to the basin or harbor. History and Description of the Baltimore and Ohio. Baltimore, 1853.

[2] Ninth annual report to Baltimore and Ohio stockholders.

[3] *Intelligencer*, April 23, 1835. Statement of William Elliot, city surveyor, who with the surveyor of the railroad laid out the route.

[4] Other pieces of Washington real estate acquired by the company at this time was half of Square 574, to the north of the square where the ticket office was located, and Square 718, bounded by Delaware Avenue, H, I and 2d streets, northeast.

CHAPTER VI

THE CANAL FAILURE

Five years after the citizens saw with glad eyes the flag floating from the city hall, proclaiming far and wide the welcome news that congress had passed the bill authorizing the canal subscription, they were obliged to go to that body to ask relief from that which they had welcomed as a boon.[1] Instead of the canal being finished, only about one-half of the great ditch had been dug.[2] In place of the dividends on the canal stock and the enlarged city revenue from an expanding population and trade, the taxes had been nearly doubled and the city debt had been increased.[3] Because of the high taxes, greater "than was paid in any other city in this country,"[4] the citizens were oppressed, the growth of the city and the course of improvements were checked.[5] The annual deficit in the revenues had reached nearly $25,000.[6] "Further taxation would utterly destroy the little value remaining to our property," declared the mayor in his annual message, "and it ought not to be resorted to until we ascertain nothing can be hoped for from the justice and charity of congress."[1] At the previous session an appeal had been made to congress by the corporation[2] for aid in this emergency, which three years later reached the acute stage when the city defaulted on the interest on the canal loan. What was the ground for an appeal to the justice of congress? It was a familiar one to the citizens and to some extent to members of congress. Now for the first time it was formally stated and strongly urged upon the attention of that body by one of its committees. For nearly a quarter of a century, congress was informed, the municipal corporation had borne almost the entire cost of the improvement of streets which were owned by the government. These expenditures had served to enhance the value of public property, which, however, was not taxed and therefore did not contribute to the common fund.

---

[1] 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 51, Jan. 19, 1833.

[2] *Intelligencer*, July 31, 1834.

[3] City Ordinance, Aug. 1, 1831, advancing the tax rate from 56 to 75 cents; Ordinance, Dec. 16 and Dec. 26, 1832, fixing the rate at $1.10. By the close of the year 1833, $250,000 had been borrowed on account of the canal interest. 24th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 258, March 18, 1836.

[4] *Intelligencer*, July 25, 1834.

[5] 23d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 66, Jan. 27, 1834, and Sen. Doc. No. 23, Jan. 2, 1834.

[6] The same, No. 366, March 25, 1834. The total debt including the canal subscription of one million was $1,719,814. It reached its highest point a couple of years later by the addition of about $165,000. In 1834 the population of the city was about 21,000, one-third of which were slaves and people of color.

It is true, as was pointed out, the United States had expended money on street improvement, but it was confined to Pennsylvania Avenue and the streets about the capitol and the White House. However, it was urged if congress had paid on its property in the city the same rate of tax as the citizens, the latter would not be borne down under a weight of debt. But why, it was asked, should not the government pay a tax on its property? A law of the state of New York, it was stated, authorized the city of New York in certain cases to levy a tax upon the government property within its jurisdiction.

"In several of the states of the Union," the report added, "where the government holds landed estate it has paid taxes upon it and these taxes have been expended for the ordinary municipal purpose of the places where the property was situated."[3] In addition to the improvement of the streets, it was declared by the committee, the city in its effort to erect a building for the use of the local government and the courts that would be of a character and dignity worthy of the Nation's capital had undertaken an enterprise which resulted in the lottery disaster and a large addition to the city debt, while the delay in completing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal had deprived the city of a source of revenue relied upon to enable it to meet its obligations.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 25, 1835.

[2] 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 51, Jan. 19, 1833.

[3] The same, No. 97, p. 6, Feb. 2, 1835. The Southard report. Apparently the doctrine laid down by Chief Justice Marshall sixteen years before (McCullough *vs.* Maryland, 4 Wheaton 314) that the taxation of public property was a violation of the sovereign power of the government of the United States was not generally interpreted at that time to include all property.

What was to be done? The solution of the financial problem, in the opinion of the city council, was decidedly to be found in the adoption of a system placing the public property in the city on the assessment books, to be taxed just as was done with all other property.[1] While the senate committee was not willing to go to that extent, still it was its belief "that provision ought to be made by which mutual benefits should be met by mutual burdens."

The committee did not attempt to propose a plan for the adjustment of federal and District fiscal relations, but confined itself to providing for the current emergency by recommending that congress assume the canal debt of the three towns. At the same time the committee recognized the force of the contention that had been current in the District for some years, that congress should contribute to the local revenues as a property holder. But it went beyond that and found broader grounds which after forty years were incorporated into law. For the committee declared, as the District had been created for the purposes of the Union and was not merely a local unit, it followed that federal money could properly be used in its development and care. For three sessions this subject was before congress and called forth three reports, one of which, the senate District committee report made by Samuel L. Southard of New Jersey, became a classic in the literature on the subject of the relations of the District and the general government.[1] During this period an appropriation of $70,000, or more than a year and a quarter's interest on the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal debt, was made to meet the city's interest charge. The city also borrowed money for the same purpose as long as its credit lasted. But congressional appropriation and municipal borrowings only proved to be a temporary relief. In a short time the secretary of the treasury, in accordance with the terms of the law authorizing the three towns to borrow money in order to subscribe to the canal stock, notified the president of the United States of the failure of the Washington corporation to meet the interest payments. As required by the same law, the president appointed a collector (Tench Ringgold) to assess the real and personal property in the city at the rate of $1.13 per hundred and collect the tax to pay the interest.

---

[1] Resolution adopted by the city council instructing the committee to represent the interests of the corporation before congress to petition that body to pass an act authorizing the assessment and taxation of United States property. *Intelligencer*, Aug. 6, 1835. Memorial to Congress, 24th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 23, Dec. 16, 1835.

The bankruptcy of the city was acknowledged by the mayor in reply to an inquiry from the secretary of the treasury who represented the practical indorser of the loan, namely the government of the United States. As showing the close connection of the government with this transaction, the interest was required by law to be paid at the treasury department. It was in the controller's office the accounts were kept, and the books of that official showed that in January, 1836 the city was in arrears for two interest quarters amounting to $27,500. This phase of the situation was not a new one to congress, for a year before it was declared on the floor of the senate that "the agents of the foreign creditors are here ready to purchase the property of these citizens of Washington under the hammer, so that there is danger emphatically that this city may be sold to the Dutch." It was said by those members of congress who acknowledged no right of claim to this relief that they were willing to vote for it as they did not wish to see the capital sold.[2] Alexandria had reached also the breaking point in the strain placed upon its resources, and while the interest payments had all been met, yet a short time before the relief bill was passed it was declared that the town was unable to continue any longer such payments.[1] Georgetown did not quite reach the same straits as Alexandria, although when it joined with the other two towns in praying the aid of congress, the confession was made that the town was too poor to continue to hold the stock. In both Georgetown and Alexandria the taxes had been increased.[2] The towns were willing to surrender their canal stock in order to be freed from the principal and interest, and that was the arrangement made by congress. But the people of Georgetown wanted it to be understood that it was only because they were unable to wait for the completion of the canal, when, as was very generally believed even after eight unprofitable years, the profits would make possible good dividends.[3] During the three years of discussion in congress of the canal debts of the towns much was said of the constitutionality of using public money for such a purpose, and several devices were suggested and much ingenuity displayed to avoid this objection. There was also the argument staple in debates on District affairs, that Washington has no more claim upon congress than any other town in the country. At last, however, what proved to be the final report turned aside from the constitutional phases of the case did not go into any calculations of how much public money had been spent in the District and what was the value of the public property, but gave an account of how the canal debt was contracted, pointed out the inability of the towns to meet the obligations of that debt

---

[1] 23d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 366, March 25, 1834; 23d Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 97, Feb. 2, 1835; and 24th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 111, Feb. 2, 1836.

[2] Register of Debates, pp. 614 and 616, Feb. 24, 1835.

---

[1] 24th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 111, Feb. 2, 1836, p. 4.

[2] Georgetown Ordinance, Dec. 1, 1832. Tax rate increased from 50 to 75 cents. Two years later the old rate was restored. Ordinance, Dec. 31, 1834.

In Alexandria the tax rate was raised to 75 cents. (Register of Debates, p. 790. Dec. 15, 1834. The same, p. 614.) The statement was made in the house that the average rate of tax outside of the District was 6 and 10 cents.

[3] Georgetown Memorial. 24th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 48, Jan. 11, 1836. Alexandria Memorial. 24th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 53, Jan. 13, 1836.

"fairly ascribable to the direct action of the government itself" and the ruin that then was imminent. The committee therefore recommended the absolute assumption of the debt, a course which congress followed a few months later.[1] The bill did not include, as it was hoped by citizens, the interest paid from the beginning, but only the principal. As at the beginning of the agitation in congress to secure federal aid for the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, so in these closing days, the contest between the two parties in the country on the question of internal improvements was a factor of importance. But when a conclusion had nearly been reached in the District matter, it was possible in a senate report to say there had been a change of views as to the government lending its assistance to the completion of the canal to the waters of the Ohio, as contemplated, and that it was no longer thought proper for the government to give further aid. It was a general policy. While the federal treasury was thereafter closed to public improvement enterprises, the state treasuries remained open. The District had no such recourse, as the citizens began to realize when railroads were needed.

In the course of the discussion over the District relief bill remarks were made bringing out familiar phases of congressional and District relations. In indignant protest an advocate of the canal relief measure exclaimed on the floor of the house that he never knew any subject to be discussed relative to the city of Washington without the attempt on the part of some member to build up a popularity elsewhere by abusing and making sport of the unfortunate citizens of the District.[2] Just before the canal matter was disposed of the chairman of the house District committee declared that his service on the committee had been extremely unpleasant "because," he added "it is disgusting to witness the temper and spirit with which the most ordinary appropriations for the benefit of the District are received in this house. Some gentlemen seem to regard the District of Columbia with the same feelings with which doctors regard animal life. They look upon it as a rat under an exhausted receiver, where political empirics may display their quackery without any danger of being called to account for their folly or ignorance."[1] To Washington the pecuniary relief was almost immediate. A few months after the debt relief measure became a law the tax rate was reduced to the normal level, and a year later the city receipts, for the first time in several years, were more than the expenditures.[2]

---

[1] 24th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 111, Feb. 2, 1836; U. S. Law, May 20, 1836.

[2] Register of Debates, p. 4399, June 1, 1834.

No principle was settled as to the relations of congress and the District. No recognition was given to the doctrine as set forth in the Southard report of mutual benefits and mutual burdens, and only an implied recognition was made of the federal character of the District. It was an emergency measure somewhat similar to the one passed nine years before, when Alexandria was ravaged by fire, and congress appropriated $20,000 for the relief of those suddenly made homeless and indigent.[3] As the first appropriation of public money in the District for a purpose not governmental, the subject was so novel that the constitutional lawyers in the house consumed a whole day in debating whether or not public funds could be expended for such a purpose. Nor was there lacking on that occasion the voice of the protestant, who cried out against such an appropriation because in his state no public money had been given on a like occasion.

It was then asserted that the receipts of the treasury are the revenues of the government, not alone in its legislative and enumerated powers, but also as the legislature of the District.[4] For quite a third of a century, what federal money was spent in the District was for the convenience and despatch of the public business. During that period the only public money used in Alexandria was for the erection of a jail in connection with the court, which was federal as well as local, while not a dollar had been expended in Georgetown.[1] While Washington received no direct federal aid, it had an advantage over the other two towns in being benefited by the money expended on public buildings and in having the use of Pennsylvania Avenue, as improved by the government, as well as from being the centre where money appropriated for salaries, printing, and general supplies was paid out, and in a large measure expended. At the same time a revenue was derived from those who made their homes in the city because it was the Nation's capital and from the annual flow of visitors. While, as stated, no fiscal policy towards the District was adopted when congress in 1836 assumed the canal debt of the three towns, yet federal responsibility in local affairs was acknowledged. It was not the first time. For when, in 1831, the property of the Washington Bridge Co. was carried away by a freshet, the rights of the company were purchased by congress and money appropriated and a new bridge was erected.[2] As the Long Bridge, as it was called at that period, was a link in the great mail road between the north and the south, and as the company was unable to replace the structure that had been carried away,[3] if congress wanted its mail, and the people from the southern section of the country wanted to reach their capital city promptly, a new bridge must be built, and congress alone could do it. It was plainly a national, not a local undertaking, so its advocates explained.[4] But what national interest was benefited when at the next session congress provided the money with which Georgetown was enabled to buy the Chain Bridge, and make it free, so that the toll collector would no longer bar the way to the farmers of Alexandria and Loudoun counties? No national object was urged in support of this measure. The people of Georgetown protested against the removal of the tolls from the Long Bridge as a discrimination against their town,[1] and partly to allay that feeling federal money was appropriated. In becoming the owner of the Chain Bridge the town also assumed the responsibilities of ownership, and when some seven years later the bridge was swept away, it was replaced through a loan made by the corporation.[2] A section of the Long Bridge was carried away at the same time, and a congressional appropriation was made to repair the damage. Perhaps it occurred then to some minds that it might have been better if the more enduring and at the same time more costly structure proposed by Andrew Jackson had been erected instead of the cheap makeshift which continued in use until quite recent years.

---

[1] Register of Debates, p. 3496, May 6, 1836.

[2] City Ordinance, Oct. 29, 1836. Financial statement, *Intelligencer*, June 29, 1837.

[3] U. S. Law, Jan. 24, 1827.

[4] Annals of Congress, Jan. 19, 1827, p. 68.

---

[1] Register of Debates, May 4, 1832, p. 2751. Statement as to Alexandria. Memorial of the Georgetown corporation. 24th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 48, Jan. 11, 1836.

[2] Stats., 4, 582, July 14, 1832. *Intelligencer*, Sept. 6, 1834. History of the bridge. As completed in the fall of 1835 one-third of the new structure was a causeway with draws over both the eastern and western channels. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 310.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 14, 1831.

[4] 23d Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 97, Feb. 2, 1835, p. 11.

Besides attempting to maintain an equable balance in the scale of legislative benefits, by setting off the free bridge on the road leading to Alexandria with a free bridge to Georgetown, a further benefit was conferred. For by means of this "congress fund," as the congressional appropriation was termed by the Georgetown city council, the town was able, not only to pay for the property of the bridge company, which included besides that structure the road to Georgetown and the one from the bridge through Alexandria County, to the District line, but also to give them a macadam surface. But this was not all. The fund supplied the means of opening what came to be known at first as the Upper Road, and then the New Cut Road, now Reservoir Street, extending from 34th Street, a short distance north of R, to a point on the River Road about halfway between the bridge and the town.[3] However, such a use of the money was characterized by the circuit court, some years later, as beyond the powers of the corporation.[4] A portion of the same fund made it possible for the town to continue the work, which it had carried on for years, of deepening the channel of the river.[1] The latter proved to be the beginning, and after a long interval of years, of a series of congressional appropriations for river improvement. In fact, the work on the river was mentioned first in the law, but was given this prominence, apparently, because it might be classed as a national work.[2]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 25, 1832.

[2] The same, Feb. 12, 1840.

[3] Georgetown Ordinance, May 11 and Sept. 16, 1833.

[4] Corp. of Georgetown *vs.* U. S., Aug. 25, 1858. Haywood and Hazelton, Vol. 2, p. 302.

The Georgetown appropriation remedied the apparent injustice as to the bridges, and also balanced the congressional favors between the three towns. For at this time came the appropriation of $400,000 for the Alexandria Canal, $150,000 for the Washington Canal and then $150,000 for the Georgetown improvements.[3] All these measures escaped the veto of Andrew Jackson, who in 1830, some two years before, had disapproved of an appropriation for the Frederick-Rockville Pike, because it was local, not national, in its benefits. As will be seen later on, the citizens considered the president had especially favored the District. Practically the District towns at this period followed the practice in the states, where an appeal was made to their legislatures for assistance in carrying on public works.[4] Apparently the Long Bridge project was classed as national. At that period the closed navigation season for boats on the Potomac was about two months, and then the Long Bridge was the principal means of communication. The use of steam in propelling boats had not changed this condition materially, owing to the engines of that day being too feeble to cope with ice. Steam was becoming an important factor in the transportation service, for a couple of years after the rebuilding of the Long Bridge it was proposed to supply one of the missing links in the complete railway connection between Raleigh, N. C., and New York by building the Alexandria and Falmouth Railroad between Fredericksburg, Va., and Washington, the proposed route of some sixty-eight miles passing through the thinly settled country bordering the river. Federal aid was sought for a line that could not expect a profitable local business but would be dependent on the through travel. It would do away with the nine-mile stage ride from Fredericksburg to Aquia and some 40 miles by boat to Washington.[1] It was proposed to enter Washington over the Long Bridge or, as an alternative, use the aqueduct to Georgetown and make a connection with the Baltimore Railroad at that point.

---

[1] In his annual message in 1821 the mayor of Georgetown, John Peter, stated that the debt of the town was $56,340, and of this amount all but $4105 had been spent on the improvement of the river. *Intelligencer*, Dec. 15, 1821.

[2] Stats., 4, 646, March 2, 1833.

[3] The dates of the various enactments are as follows: Alexandria Canal, June 25, 1832; the Washington Canal bill, May 31, 1832, and March 2, 1833; Georgetown improvements, March 2, 1833.

[4] Register of Debates, p. 2751, May 4, 1832.

At that time railway connection had just been completed between Richmond and Fredericksburg,[2] but it was not until a year later that steam cars took the place of the steamboat between Wilmington and Philadelphia,[3] so that an all-rail journey could be made from Washington to New York. The time was about twelve hours. Congress, however, did not supply the money, and the direct route, as proposed, was not built until early in the seventies. In 1851, after some fourteen years, by the help of the Virginia legislature a line was built south from Alexandria to Orange, and by the help of the Washington city corporation a line was built north of Alexandria to the southern end of the Long Bridge. It will be noted that public money was needed in both instances, as some years passed before it was possible to finance such enterprises by individual subscription.

As had already been pointed out, the period of wavering and doubt as to the general government entering upon the work of internal improvements had come to an end. A proposed test of the expediency and effectiveness of federal aid in developing railway enterprises in the legislative experiment station of the District of Columbia was not made, as congress refused appropriations for both the Washington Branch of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the proposed Alexandria and Falmouth Railroad.

---

[1] 24th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 161, Feb. 7, 1837. Also same congress, House Doc. No. 238, Feb. 16, 1837.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 18, 1837.

[3] The same, July 4, 1838.

Some years prior to the attempt to commit the government to a policy of internal improvements through a District measure, the District had been made the battle-ground upon which for nearly four decades the contest over slavery was waged. The field of action was chosen, not because of concern in the District, but because there congress had the power of exclusive legislation and could at a stroke do away with the entire system. The national rather than the local character of this movement was early recognized in congress, and when a memorial was presented asking that a law be enacted to make children born thereafter of slave parents in the District free, it was branded on the floor of the house as breathing "the spirit of general emancipation."[1] The recognition of the strategic position of the District in the contest came at a still earlier period; for then those in favor of the entire abolition of slavery, while few in numbers, could boast a newspaper, the first in the United States, to advocate immediate and uncompensated emancipation.[2] As early as 1817 the national significance of a victory for emancipation in the District was pointed out in the columns of the weekly *Philanthropist*, published at Mount Pleasant, Ohio.[3] A decade, however, passed before the assault on congress by petition fairly began. At the same time local circumstances and conditions served to bring the slavery question in one or other of its aspects before congress. It was a local happening that gave rise to the first discussion in the national legislature of slavery in the District.[4] For a few months previous, in December, 1815, the city was stirred by the tragic story of a slave woman who, in a frenzy of despair, had thrown herself from the attic story of a tavern at the southwest corner of

---

[1] Annals of Congress, Feb. 27, 1827, p. 1099.

[2] McMaster, 5, 208.

[3] Slavery in D. C. University of Nebraska papers, p. 58.

[4] The first resolution on the subject was offered in the house in 1805 and proposed emancipation, but it was voted down without discussion.

13th and F streets, northwest, choosing to die rather than to be taken south away from her husband and her family. The woman survived the fall, but was naturally not in a marketable condition, and was left behind when the slave-trader went away with his drove of men and women.[1] As they left the tavern, handcuffed in pairs and attached to a chain between the two ranks, and marched through the streets on the way to the Long Bridge, they presented a spectacle which, while evidently not uncommon, was none the less neither a welcome nor a commendable one to many in the community of that day.

A few weeks later the attention of the grand jury was called by Judge Morsell to the frequency with which the streets of the city had been crowded with manacled captives, a sight, in the opinion of the court, shocking to the feelings of humane persons.[2] But it was not unlawful. Under the Maryland law of 1796 slaves could not be brought into Washington County for sale or to reside, but there was no prohibition to their being brought through en route.

A circumstance connected with this tragic occurrence throws additional light on the sentiment of the community. For in the garret room where the slave woman had been confined, and to which she was brought back, Jesse Torrey, Jr., a visitor to the city, a young man of philanthropic impulses, found not only the injured woman, but also a man and a woman and her child, who asserted that they were free and had been kidnapped from their homes in Delaware and were to be taken south and sold, a practice which appealed to the cupidity of unscrupulous men. Torrey interested himself in the case. He had but slender means, but he told the story of the captives to various citizens, and in a short time a fund was subscribed and he was on his way to Delaware. There he gathered the necessary evidence, and with the legal services of Francis Scott Key, E. B. Caldwell and J. B. Lear, which were rendered without compensation, he secured their freedom.[1] This event, and its sequel, attracted the attention of John Randolph of Virginia, who in his place in the house arraigned in his characteristic style the traffic in slaves, and said there was no market as great and infamous as the one in Washington. As the result of the discussion which followed, a committee was directed to investigate the subject. A report of the evidence taken was submitted, but it was not printed. There was no further action.[2] On the other hand, the opinion prevailed that while such abuses occur under the law intended to apply to runaway slaves, "but that circumstance which is common to every institution of human society would not, we should suppose, justify its repeal." The sufferer under such a law, it was pointed out, "is punished for not having a pass or certificate of his freedom, and the latter is due to the system of slavery. Without such a regulation society would be perpetually incommoded by runaways and outcasts." [3] The District was not free from the apprehension, which apparently was never absent from a slaveholding community, of some uprising on the part of those held in bondage.[4] When the free colored began to increase in number, the problem of the place in the community of men and women who were not slaves, and yet not citizens, was handled entirely by the city corporation, and not by congress. Authority, however, was given in the city charter, granted by congress in 1820, to send to prison free colored persons convicted of disorderly conduct, which in effect legalized the ordinances of 1808 and 1812. These laws imposed penalties of fine and imprisonment on free colored persons convicted of violations of city ordinances or failure to have certificates of their freedom. The flow of the free colored into the city continued with increasing volume, while the slaves decreased in number.[1] The progress of emancipation in Maryland and in other states to the north explains largely the growth in numbers of the free colored. What to do with this class was not therefore a local problem. A solution, believed by many, was found in colonization, and when in the fall of 1816 Rev. Robert Finley, of Basking Ridge, N. J., came to Washington, and with the help of his brother-in-law, E. B. Caldwell, organized the American Colonization Society for the purpose of sending the free colored to a colony to be formed in Africa, the project met with favor, especially in the slaveholding states.[2] Washington was made the headquarters, and branch societies were organized in various states. In the course of some eight years the society had its newspaper organ, a monthly known as the *African Repository.*[3] Hardly had this scheme been launched when a meeting was held, in Georgetown, of the people whom the new organization sought to benefit, and who positively refused to accept the proffered boon.[4] This first protest went unheeded. But, as it proved, the Georgetown meeting voiced the sentiments of the free people of color of this country, so that the work of the society had but small practical part in what was declared on the floor of the house a few years later to be the real issue, namely, "What to do with the colored people."[5] Although the civil rights of the free colored people of the District were limited, and the letter of the law harsh and restrictive, yet, as had been seen, their numbers increased. They accumulated property, and in many instances their children were educated in the white private schools and attended the Sunday schools and evening schools designed for the benefit of the children of the white, whom poverty or other circumstances had deprived of educational advantages.[1] In addition, the enterprise and judgment of this class, as early as the year 1807, led to the opening of a school for the education of free colored children.[2] This first schoolhouse for colored children in the District was of frame and erected on the square bounded by New Jersey Avenue, D and 1st streets, southeast, at the expense of three colored men, George Bell, Nicholas Franklin and Moses Liverpool. All of them had been slaves and had acquired their freedom. Although unable to read themselves, yet they determined to use their small savings in order that their children, and those of their neighbors, might have that advantage. In some respects the experience of George Bell in securing his freedom may be regarded as typical. Both he and his wife were slaves owned by different families living in the vicinity of Washington. The wife was allowed to have a garden and to sell the vegetables. Saving this money, she was able, some six years before the school enterprise, to purchase her husband's freedom, and then subsequently she fell sick, and her life being despaired of, a small sum of money made her a free woman. The parents also succeeded in buying the freedom of their children, one of whom was the wife of John F. Cook. The latter became a school-teacher and a minister of the gospel. His two sons were men of repute as citizens of Washington. The New Jersey Avenue school continued for several years, and then the building was occupied as a residence.[3] Several years later a more ambitious plan was

---

[1] Portraiture of Domestic Slavery. Jesse Torrey, Jr., 1817. *City of Washington Gazette*, April 30 and May 11, 1819.

[2] The same, p. 42.

---

[1] Portraiture of Domestic Slavery, p. 52. One of the engravings represents the tavern building, which, however, appears to be largely fanciful, while another is of the east front of the capitol, showing a procession of manacled slaves passing across the plaza.

[2] Annals of Congress, March 1, 1816, pp. 1115–1117.

[3] *Washington City Weekly Gazette*, Feb. 17, 1816.

[4] The letters of Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith and the diary of Mrs. William Thornton show how constant and real were their anxiety in this particular, even in the midst of the terror and flight from the city in the summer of 1814.

---

[1] In 1800 there were 623 slaves in Washington and 123 free colored in a total population of 3210. In 1820 the slaves numbered 1945, the free colored 1826 in a population of 13,247; while in 1840 there were 1713 slaves, 4808 free colored in a population of 23,364. The percentage of colored to whites in 1800 was 23, in 1820, 28 and in 1840, 28.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 23, 24 and 31, 1816.

[3] The same, April 9, 1825. The office of the society in the early years was on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, a short distance west of 14th Street. The same, March 24, 1825.

The Colonization building, at the southwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 4½ Street, erected by the society for its use, was not built until more than a third of a century later. *The Star*, Aug. 22, 1859.

[4] The same, Jan. 8, 1817.

[5] Register of Debates, Jan. 6, 1829, p. 181.

---

[1] Special report of commissioner of education on public schools in the District, 1871, p. 195. Also *Intelligencer*, May 17, 1816.

[2] The same.

[3] Other schools of this period were one opened in 1809 by Henry Potter, an Englishman, at the southeast corner of 7th and F streets, N. W.; Mrs. Anne Maria Hall's school on 1st Street, east, facing

adopted, and an association was formed of free colored people and a school was started in the same building,[1] which was continued for several years. It was in this school that John Adams, "the first colored man who taught in this District," began his career as school-teacher after spending his early years as a shoemaker.[2] The progress of the free colored population in numbers and wealth is indicated, no doubt, by an advertisement offering for sale a frame building in Square 824, apparently on I between 4th and 5th streets, southeast, occupied as a church for colored people, in order that a brick meeting-house could be erected on the site.[3] Ten years passed after the occurrences in the F Street tavern, when by another happening in the District some of the conditions growing out of slavery were again ventilated in congress. In the summer of 1826, Gilbert Horton, a free colored man whose home was in New York state, while about the wharves in Georgetown was arrested as a runaway slave, and was duly committed to jail by a justice of the peace. As he had no means to establish the fact of his freedom, and his prison charges were against him, he was in accordance with the corporation law advertised to be sold for these charges. His case was brought to the attention of the governor of New York, his freedom established and he was released.[4] When congress assembled that fall, one of the members from New York state called the attention of the house to the Horton case, and offered a resolution, which was adopted, instructing the committee on the District to ascertain if there is any law in the District which authorizes the sale of a free man of color for his jail fees. A few weeks later the committee, to put an end to such a practice, reported a bill which provided for the payment by the town corporations

---

the capitol; Mrs. Mary Billing, an Englishwoman, opened a school in 1810 on Dumbarton Street between 31st Street and Wisconsin Avenue, the first colored school in Georgetown. Special report Commissioner of Education, p. 195.

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 29, 1818.

[2] Special report Commissioners of Education, p. 198.

[3] *Intelligencer*, June 11, 1823.

[4] Annals of Congress, Dec. 26, 1826, p. 555.

of Washington County of the jail fees in runaway cases when freedom was established, a measure, as was declared, similar to the one in Maryland, where the presumption that all persons of color were slaves had been abandoned. But no final action was reached, and no change was made in the city ordinance which had then been in force for five years, and which directed that negroes without evidence of their freedom be committed to jail, "to be dealt with as is provided by the laws of Maryland or of the United States in the case of absconding slaves." [1] The Maryland law of 1719, like other laws of that state in force in 1790, had been continued by congress in force in the District, and had not been altered or repealed. This law authorized the sale for jail fees of runaway slaves, as all colored people were classed who could not produce evidence of freedom. But it had not been enforced. Prior to the passage of the corporation law of 1821 the only punishment imposed on the free colored in the city was fine or imprisonment. Unless attention had been called to the case of Gilbert Horton in 1826 and evidence secured that he was a free man he would have been sold as a slave with the prospect of remaining in that condition for the rest of his life.[2] That free men were actually sold into slavery in due process of law in force in the District was asserted in the house. One of the members, Charles Miner of Pennsylvania, visited the city jail, which he found was used as a place of safe-keeping for slaves while on their way to the southern slave market, but he also found that in 1823 and 1824 fifteen committed as runaways were found to be free, and one was sold for jail fees and expenses.[3] A few months later the committee on the District, to which the subject had been referred, confirmed the truth of the assertion, that at the Nation's capital free men were sold into a life of slavery.[4] In Alexandria County, however, the house was told that pending the proof of a colored man's right to freedom he is bound out to pay his jail fees, and if the evidence is not produced at the end of twelve months, then he is sold as a runaway slave. But in Washington County the committee found if a colored man, apprehended as a runaway slave, fails to pay his jail fees, he is liable to be sold as a slave. In the judgment of the committee no change in the Alexandria County law was necessary, but in Washington County it was recommended that the jail charges in such cases be paid by the corporation of Washington and Georgetown.

---

[1] Ordinance, April 24, 1821.

[2] Owing probably to fewer numbers and slower increase in the number of free colored, neither Georgetown nor Alexandria found it necessary to legislate on this subject in the early years.

[3] Register of Debates, Dec. 26, 1826, p. 563.

[4] 19th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 43, Jan. 11, 1827.

As congress did nothing, the citizens of the District entered a protest against the continuance of such a practice. A memorial was presented at the next session, signed by more than one thousand citizens of the District. In language that evinced a deep sense of the disgrace and odium of the existing slave trade, the memorialists asked that the system be done away with, as well as provision be made for the gradual emancipation of the slaves. A case was cited of the sale into slavery of "colored men claiming to be free," and thus, exclaimed the memorialists in remarkable phrase, "a human being was sold into perpetual bondage at the capital of the freest government on earth without even a pretence of trial or an allegation of crime."[1] At that time an abolition society was in existence in Washington, having been organized in 1827, some two years before the memorial was sent to congress.[2]

This protest, so earnest in its tone and so sweeping in its scope, caused a renewal of the discussion in the house. Then Mr. Miner asserted that in 1826–1827 five colored men, without any proof of their being slaves, were sold.[3] Again the District committee made a report, and when that was laid before the house, it was found that the recommendation of the committee of the last congress, which was designed to put an end to the sale of free colored men for prison charges, had been renewed.

---

[1] 20th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 215, March 24, 1828.

[2] Lundy, p. 109. In a list of twelve new societies given by Lundy under date of March, 1827, the District is credited with two. See also notice of a meeting of the Washington society. *Intelligencer*, March 10, 1828.

[3] In Register of Debates, p. 175, June 6, 1829.

As to the wish of the citizens of Washington for an emancipation law, the committee was of the opinion, and quoted the grand jury of Washington County to the same effect, that even the proposed plan of emancipation, to apply after the year 1828 only to children born of slaves in the District after having reached the age of twenty-five, would afford no relief unless the colored people could be removed from the country.[1] So that again in this movement progress was blocked by what had been declared, years before, to be the real obstacle in the way of solving the slavery problem, and that was, What to do with the colored people. However, congress did not do what the committee pointed out could be done, and that was, authorize the two corporations to pay prison charges instead of selling free men into slavery. The practice continued, except as it was mitigated by requiring the purchaser at such sales to give security not to sell the slave thus acquired out of the District.[2] Two years after the memorial had been sent to congress the city council attempted to do away with the slave trade by imposing what was regarded as a prohibitory license fee on those engaged in the business of slave-trader.[3] But again the way was blocked, as the circuit court decided that such an enactment was beyond the chartered powers of the corporation.[4] In the current state of public opinion on slavery, three decades before the war, it was not inconsistent that the same community, which sustained an abolition society, memorialized congress in language elevated in tone and instinct with righteous indignation to abolish the slave trade and provide for emancipation, should attempt to mitigate the severity rather than repeal the old Maryland law concerning runaway slaves.

Already, however, the rising tide of antislavery sentiment throughout the country was beginning to centre upon freeing the District from the institution. The clarion voice of William

---

[1] 20th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 60, Jan. 29, 1829.

[2] The same, 1st. Sess., House Doc. No. 215, March 24, 1828. The citizens' memorial mentioned the failure to exact such a requirement as one of the grievances.

[3] Ordinance, July 28, 1831. The license fee was $400 per annum.

[4] *National Era*, Sept. 9, 1847.

Lloyd Garrison, then not recognized as a leader of the attacking host, at this time declared that "the District is the first citadel to be carried." [1] With this in mind, he proposed to establish in Washington a new paper, the *Liberator*. But Benjamin Lundy, with whom he had been associated in the publication at Baltimore of the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, decided to publish that periodical in Washington, and so Garrison chose Boston for his venture.[2] For about two years Lundy continued his paper at the capital city.[3] Eight months after the *Liberator* began its noted career, the Nat Turner insurrection in Southampton County, Va., which spread fear and alarm throughout the slaveholding states, was attributed to the influence of Garrison's paper. Both the editor and the publication were denounced in the slave states, and the circulation of the latter in some of them was forbidden. The corporation of Georgetown for the first time felt it necessary to enact an ordinance for the regulation of free colored people, and while their sale for fines and prison fees was authorized, yet it was to be, "as a servant for any time not exceeding four months." [4] Included, however, in the list of offences thus punishable was the subscription to or having in their possession or circulating books or papers "calculated to excite insurrection or insubordination among the slaves or colored people . . . and particularly a newspaper called the *Liberator*."

While such expressions no doubt show the trend of public opinion, and especially opposition to what was looked upon as likely to disturb and unsettle existing conditions, yet a few months before the Georgetown corporation placed its ban on Garrison's paper, or at least its circulation among colored people, public notice was given of a meeting of the abolition society of Washington.[1] Less than two years before, the sessions of the American Antislavery convention were held in Washington,[2] and in the spring of 1831 the activity of the Washington society in preparing and circulating memorials to congress was noted with approval by the *Genius.*[3] A year later the effect of the Virginia slave outbreak and the increase in the circulation of antislavery papers and literature may be traced in a change in sentiment in Washington when Lundy records "opposition to everything like emancipation runs high, and the abolition society here has not met for some time."[4] The agitation went on outside of the District. The literature of protest increased in volume. Renewed interest was displayed in the north on the subject of slavery in the District. Petitions poured in on congress. The usual course was followed. They were received, referred to committees reports made and discussed. It was not until four years passed that the policy of congress, or at least of the house, was changed. Then, in 1835, the famous gag rule was adopted, directing all petitions relating to slavery in the District, without being presented or referred, be laid on the table and no further action taken.[5] For nearly a decade the notable contest of John Quincy Adams for the right of petition based on this action was carried on with remarkable determination, but before the resolute old man won his fight the contest against slavery broadened so as to include the territories as well as the District. The policy of paying no attention to slavery petitions did not check the flow. As, however, the ear of the public could not be reached in this way, private presses were set to work. The product was placed in the mails and went throughout the country. In the south it was soon realized what was being done. Then the mails were seized, and as the passions and fears of the people were aroused, mob violence became common. For the first time a mob appeared in the streets of

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 20, 1830. Advertisement of proposals for issuing in Washington a weekly paper to be entitled *The Liberator and Journal of the Times*.

[2] William Lloyd Garrison, New York, 1891, pp. 87 and 115.

[3] Life of Lundy, p. 257. Philadelphia, 1847. For some time before January, 1834, the paper bore the imprint of Washington, but generally it was not printed there, but wherever the editor happened to be and was able to get a printing-press and the money. See also Life of Garrison, p. 244.

[4] Georgetown Ordinance, Oct. 8, 1831.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 9, 1831.

[2] Lundy, p. 236.

[3] The same, p. 238.

[4] Life, p. 257. April, 1832.

[5] Register of Debates, Appendix, p. 104, 1835.

Washington, and for two days and three nights in the summer of 1835 did its will.

This reign of terror, for it proved to be that in a community not prepared to cope with such a situation, and where the entire police force consisted of three men, began in Georgetown, where excited tongues had circulated the story that a recent comer to the town was in reality an agent for the distribution of incendiary literature. As was brought out in the trial, which was held eight months later,[1] Dr. Reuben Crandall, a citizen of New York, and a graduate of medicine as well as a teacher of botany, had come to the District to pursue his favorite study, and also to deliver lectures on the subject. Among his books and packages were some antislavery newspapers, which were noticed by some one who happened to visit his lodgings. In the then excited state of the public mind this circumstance, which was shown to be entirely free from design, was regarded as criminal in character. By the time the botanist had appeared before a justice of the peace a crowd had gathered, and the situation seemed so threatening that the accused man was hurried off to the Washington jail for safe-keeping. The story spread, and that night a mob appeared at the jail.[2] It is probable the botanist with his specimens, even though wrapped in antislavery newspapers, would not have stirred up even a portion of the community to take the law in their own hands if there had not been other contributing causes which added fuel to the flame. Only the previous week the community had been aroused by an attempt made on the life of Mrs. William Thornton by one of her slaves, a young colored man.[3] Three days later the writer of a newspaper communication no doubt voiced the general feeling when he wrote, that if Mrs. Thornton with all her kindness to this man was thus treated, what had other citizens to expect? For the attempt, so desperate in character, was believed to be due to the state of the man's mind, inflamed by what he had read of the wrongs of his race.

---

[1] Trial of Reuben Crandall, M.D., Washington, 1835. The first case of a man charged with endeavoring to excite insurrection among slaves and the free colored population brought before a judicial tribunal.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 12, 1835.

[3] The same, Aug. 7, 1835. The man was convicted in January, 1836, of burglary and felonious assault and sentenced to be hung, but was sold out of the jurisdiction as the law allowed.

While the crowd stood baffled before the walls of the city jail that night in August, it was recalled that Beverly Snow, a free mulatto who had for three years been the proprietor of a restaurant at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th Street, northwest, "much frequented by the good society of Washington,"[1] had spoken in disrespectful terms of the wives and daughters of mechanics. This was sufficient, and the crowd hastened to the restaurant, but not finding Snow, they dispersed.[2] The next day the mob again assembled, began to search for Snow, and not finding him, wrecked his place and burned the houses of some free people of color and broke the windows in one of the colored churches. The *Intelligencer* spoke of the mob as a handful, a large part of them boys, but it kept the city in terror.[3] Besides the lack of adequate police, the militia had fallen away into nothingness. All that was left of that body of citizen soldiery were so-called companies of men without arms or equipment, who responded to calls on muster days to avoid the payment of fines. Of late years the system had fallen into such disfavor that not even such a semblance of the organization had been maintained.[4] A small force of United States troops, by the evening of the second day, was posted at the entrance to the public buildings, while the clerks, supplied with arms, stood at the windows. A detachment of marines guarded the jail. The major-general commanding the District militia, Walter Jones,[5] as his command no longer existed, issued a call to citizens who had arms to assemble at the city hall, and by the third night a small force was at his disposal. Two military companies from Alexandria arrived in the city and tendered their services, while an offer of similar aid from Georgetown was a source of encouragement. That evening the situation seemed to promise a conflict. For while the armed band of citizens was drawn up near the city hall, two squares to the south on Pennsylvania Avenue, the mob madly surged about. But, as it proved, the two bodies did not meet, as the mob moved off to Capitol Hill, where a building occupied by free negroes was destroyed. The next day the scenes of violence were not renewed, and the city again resumed its orderly appearance.

---

[1] William Winston Seaton, p. 218.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 13; *Globe*, Aug. 14, 1835.

[3] William Winston Seaton, p. 217. The mob, Miss Seaton states, was composed of several hundred mechanics of the navy yard out of employment and their sympathizers.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 13, 1835.

[5] In 1827 Mr. Jones resigned as brigadier-general in command of the brigade of Alexandria County, and was succeeded, by appointment of President Adams, by Wm. F. Thornton. At that time Walter Smith of Georgetown was in command of the militia, and two years later he

The public exposure of the state of the militia merely emphasized a condition with which the citizens were familiar. The effectiveness of the system received a serious check when the circuit court, in 1833, decided that government clerks were exempt from militia duty.[1] A month later, at a public meeting, the system was declared to be productive of no good, but of much evil, and ought to be modified or abolished.[2] Is it not shameful, asked the writer of a newspaper communication, only two months before the Snow riot, that citizens must leave their employment and stand an hour or so in the fields in the sun or rain, waiting for the commanding officers to come and tell them to go home? Last year, he went on, when he attended a muster, the captain of the company to which he belonged drove up in a carriage, and after calling the roll dismissed the company.[3] As was stated, when the men were needed in defence of the city, they were without arms or equipment, and while the militia had been reorganized ten years after the war,[4] no change had been made in the law of 1803,

---

was succeeded by Walter Jones. After the war the enrolment of the militia was sufficient for a brigade in each county. The rank of the commanding officer was then that of major-general.

[1] 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 22, p. 13, Dec. 12, 1834.

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 8, 1833.

[3] The same, June 3, 1835.

[4] The same, Sept. 13, 16 and 18, 1824, and April 9, 1830, and April 21, 1831.

which had been observed only in a perfunctory way. The system as carried out, it was declared, was not only a complete burlesque, but a medium of oppression and tyranny.[1] A resolution was adopted at a public meeting, pledging the members of the various companies in Washington County neither, "to sell or to buy, or in any other way whatsoever countenance or hold communication with any person holding a commission or warrant, or in any other manner, command in the militia of the District."[2] At that meeting the use of the weapon of ridicule was also decided upon, and arrangements were made to hold a fantastical parade. On the last Saturday in June Pennsylvania Avenue was the scene of a ridiculous and motley parade in travesty of a military procession, and as predicted, after this display even the pretence of maintaining the militia system was abandoned in a burst of laughter.[3] So entirely discredited in the community had even the idea of citizen soldiery become, that when the militia system was abandoned, even volunteer companies were not maintained. In the year 1836 there was not in the city a single organized military corps.[4] The following year, however, companies began to be formed, the Washington Light Infantry Co., which is now a part of the District National Guard, being the first.[5] Two cavalry troops were also formed.[6] The Washington City Guards, which came into existence at this time, achieved the distinction of being the first company to have a band,[7] while the Light Infantry, soon after the celebration of its third anniversary, rented a room on C Street for use as an armory, where the rifles were kept that had been allotted to the company by the secretary of war.[8] The stress of the so-called Snow riot, while it made emphatic the collapse of the militia system, yet did not turn public attention to the lack of a night police force in the city, or in fact of any police system used primarily to maintain peace and order. The need of what in other towns was regarded as an essential part of a city government, and had been in operation in the other two towns of the District for years, did not become apparent until the year 1837.[1] The city council was petitioned at that time to provide a night force, but did not do so. The following year, owing to the disorderly conduct of groups of young men roaming about the streets at night, a citizen patrol was established in the more populous wards, which was maintained for a couple of seasons. A species of night police court was created as the magistrates kept open their offices while the patrol was on duty.[2] While the quiet of the night was at times disturbed by brawlers and by the noisy hilarity of youthful gangs, and occasionally an assault was committed, yet it is probable the record of Washington, for good order, stands unequalled among American cities of that period. For almost forty years, while the population was growing each year, and had at the close of that period reached 24,000, the city was entirely without police protection at night, and practically so during the day. If the confidence of the citizens in the honesty and good intentions of their fellows was as thorough as that which prevailed at the White House, it may be concluded that doors were left unlocked and windows unbarred. Two occurrences illustrate how entirely unguarded and unprotected was the residence of the chief magistrate.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 3 and 15, 1835.

[2] The same.

[3] *Washington Mirror*, July 4, 1835, giving an account of the affair. Reprinted in the *Washington Star*, March 16, 1907.

[4] *Intelligencer*, May 24, 1836.

[5] The same, May 8, 1837.

[6] The same, June 9, 1837. In the issues of June 25 and July 4, 1838, are given the names of the military organizations. In 1838 the only military company in Georgetown had been recently organized.

[7] The same, Sept. 25, 1838.

[8] The same, Dec. 9, 1840.

One April night President Jackson was aroused from sleep by the noise of some one trying the door of his bedchamber. He asked who was there, and a strange voice replied, that he wanted to find his way out of the house. Other members of the family were awakened, and the intruder was seized and was found to be unarmed. He had the appearance of a laborer, and had evidently gotten into the house to do some petty thieving, and becoming lost in its vastness, was unable, as he very frankly told the president, to get out. He was placed in one of the rooms in the east terrace formerly used as a stable, but by the morning he had disappeared.[1] Five years later a man under the influence of liquor wandered into the grounds of the White House, and coming to the house, opened one of the windows, got inside and after removing a portion of his clothing, went to sleep in one of the rooms. President Van Buren or any member of the household was not disturbed, but the next morning the clothes in the room and a man partly dressed roaming about the grounds told the story of this incident of the night.[2]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 29, June 6 and Dec. 29, 1837.

[2] The same, June 1, 1838, and Sept. 16, 1839, Sept. 7, 1840, and May 20, 1842.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 20, 1835.

[2] The same, Jan. 3, 1840.

CHAPTER VII

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT

THE decade that came to an end in the early thirties, so fruitful in legislation that made the laws and the administration of justice in the District more in harmony with current conditions and less burdensome to the people, was also marked by an almost continuous agitation for a change in the government. Such a purpose was not accomplished, but the dissatisfaction with government by congress, expressed as it was by the publicity given to its shortcomings as well as by constant efforts to get away from it, had an influence in directing the attention of congress as never before to District affairs. For during this period, in addition to modernizing the penalties of the criminal laws, restricting the scope of the debt imprisonment laws, improving legal procedure and providing a penitentiary, the three towns were aided by congressional appropriations in the execution of public works and were relieved of the canal debt. Yet while some grievances had been removed, many still remained a constant reminder of the failure of government by congress to care for District needs.

At this period, as during the previous years, no new ideas as to what the government should be were developed. The usual stock arguments were used. While the loss of political rights and the political degradation of the people of the District, as the phrase went, weighed on the minds of some, yet they were those to whom such a loss was more apparent than real and even if real must be regarded as necessary and inevitable.[1] When the line of argument was carried to the extreme of declaring that they who did not like the District government were not obliged to live under it, then in reply it was claimed that was only begging the question.[1] Besides freeing the people of the District from a condition of political serfdom, another important advantage, it was declared, would be gained by a government for the District, in relieving congress from duties which unduly occupied time that ought to be given to national questions rather than mere petty local concerns.[2]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 10, 1820.

On the other hand, it was pointed out that the government of the District was confided to congress by the constitution, and while it was true that agencies could be used, yet this power could not permanently be transferred. Some of the advocates of change favored the establishment of a government for the entire District on the plan of the territorial governments which at that time were being created in embryo states, thus providing a legislature with a delegate in the national house.[3] But when in 1818 in the second annual message of President Monroe the proposition was stated "whether an arrangement better adapted to the principles of our government and to the particular interests of the people may not be devised which will neither infringe the constitution nor affect the object for which the provision in question was intended to secure," then the flood-gates were opened. The people of the three towns were aroused. The theorists and political philosophers so numerous in the District from the beginning came to the front. The *Intelligencer*, that had always opposed the system that divested the citizens of the political rights enjoyed by citizens elsewhere in the United States, declared the president's message shows that "he is alive to the abject and forlorn political condition of the District."[4] The subject was at once taken up by a select committee of the house, and it was proposed to provide a government for the District. A hearing was given to deputations sent by the three towns, and from this source the committee learned that a decided majority of the people were opposed to assuming at the present time the responsibility of self-government.[1] It was stated that some of the citizens, although not a majority, favored a convention where the wishes of the people might be ascertained, while there were others who were of the opinion that a delegate on the floor of the house would be conducive to District interests. As the result of the hearing the editor of the *Intelligencer* concluded that the present form of government would be retained for some time.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 21, 1818.

[2] Annals of Congress, p. 554, March 29, 1820.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 31, 1816, and Oct. 21, 1818. Michigan and Florida had just been made territories.

[4] Nov. 20, 1818.

In the opinion of the writer of a communication in the *City of Washington Gazette*,[2] the present was the time to heed the old adage, "Look before you leap." "For," as he observed, "that it is inexpedient and dangerous to sever the constitutional link that binds us to congressional authority has been decided by the voice of the people," referring to the current meetings and discussions. "That the assumption of self-government," he continued, "and the supremacy of the national legislature is incompatible, resulting from a violation of the constitution, cannot be denied but by some cavilling dogmatist. Would a self-government counteract the loss of the seat of government? If in the event we should have a local legislature, our code of laws will be subject to the revision of congress. We will be a dependent body, no better than we were before and perhaps not so good." While unanimity was lacking as to what change if any ought to be made, yet the current discussion brought out the serious dissatisfaction with the government by congress. But it was mainly outside of Washington and was due in part to the disproportionate growth and prosperity of Washington, and disappointment over the failure of congress to respond to local needs in the other towns.[3] A

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 6, 1819.

[2] Jan. 5, 1819.

[3] As to the population the census figures show the relative growth of the three towns.

	Washington	Georgetown	Alexandria
1810	8,208	4948	7552
1820	13,247	7360	8218
1830	18,835	8441	8263
1840	23,364	7312	8459

large element in both Georgetown and Alexandria felt their interests, neglected and ignored by congress, would be served by getting entirely outside of the range of its exclusive legislation. A return to the mother states was advocated, and in both towns a vote was taken, and while retrocession was defeated, it was only on the ground that it was not feasible at that time.[1] On the other hand, at a public meeting of the citizens of Washington satisfaction with existing conditions was expressed and a government for the District was opposed.[2] But the discussion ran on, and a year later the editor of the *City of Washington Gazette,*[3] in protest against the continuance of such a movement, asked, "Who is there so blind as not to perceive that once discarded by congress the connection between the government and the District is broken and that congress owning and caring for nothing but the public buildings, may remove from this as from any other independent jurisdiction upon the plea of convenience or expediency? Who is at the bottom of these agitations? Are there among us citizens ambitious of office who would seek to separate the fate of the District from the unity of the Nation? Let them pause."

A few weeks later he returned to the charge with the shot, "if we abdicate the patronage of congress, we may immeasureably sink into insignificance and the interests of this rising national metropolis be torn to pieces by petty factions."[4] At that time the editor did not fail again to charge the advocates of a change as being prompted more by hopes of office than the welfare of the District.[5] At this time the Georgetown common council adopted resolutions opposing a territorial government because of the expense and also for the reason that the representation of that town would be less than that of the other two towns.[6] At the same time, believing that a code of laws provided by congress without the agency of the people is incompatible with every principle of a free government, and that taxation without representation is slavery, the Georgetown fathers recommended that a meeting of citizens be held to consider a memorial to congress, asking the retrocession to Maryland of all the portion of the District west of Rock Creek and north of the Potomac. But that recommendation was not carried out.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 11, 1819. Seven years later, at a regular town election in Georgetown, retrocession was carried by one vote. *Intelligencer*, March 2, 1826.

[2] The same, Jan. 8, 1819.

[3] Jan. 6, 1820.

[4] April 21, 1820.

[5] A similar summary of the situation two years later is taken from the *Richmond Virginia Enquirer*. Reprinted in the *Intelligencer*, Feb. 25, 1822.

[6] *City of Washington Gazette*, Jan. 6, 1820.

It is a fair conjecture that the revelations of the feelings of the people of the District towards its legislature made at this time were a factor in making helpful and fruitful the period of legislation for the District from 1823 to 1836.

Then came the decision of the Supreme Court confirming the legality of the law of Feb. 27, 1815, which included the District within the range of the direct tax law imposed by congress and apportioned among the states according to population. Because of the uncertainty in congress as to whether the District could be included, a special act was passed, so that in a few months after the enemy left the city the citizens were called upon to pay an extraordinary tax laid on their real estate and personal property.[1] This confirmation of the power of congress in the District, and especially not only of its right, but of the actual enforcement of that right to directly tax unrepresented citizens, gave additional edge as years went on to the sharpness of the criticism of the un-American character of the government of the District. Several years later congress rejected a resolution giving the District representation on the floor of the house,[2] but authorized an inquiry to be made as to the expediency of retroceding the entire District with the exception of the city of Washington. A bill was also introduced providing for a delegated convention to devise a form of government to be submitted to congress.[1] But none of these schemes secured the approval of the national legislature. While it was said on the floor of the house that it would be an advantage to relieve the national legislature from the necessity of attending to the needs of the District, yet, on the other hand, there were members who asked what benefit would a delegate be to the District. He would have no vote and could only tell the house what the committee on the District now tells it. If the District hoped to gain in influence in legislation by such a change, it was asserted, such expectations would be disappointed, as the District had more influence than the largest state has or ever will have.

---

[1] Report of committee that the direct tax can be applied to the District but not to the territories. Annals of Congress, Jan. 23, 1815, p. 1098. James H. Blake, the mayor of the city, was appointed collector. In the two years the tax was collected the amount required from the District was $19,998 in 1815 and $9999 in 1816. The collector was made defendant in a suit brought by Nathan Lufborough to test the law. U. S. Reports, 5 Wheaton, 320.

[2] Annals of Congress, p. 652, May 3, 1820.

But the lack of a feeling of common interest in the District as a whole, the feebleness of District pride, was what prevented largely a united front at this time on such a vital question. However, it was more than a state of passive indifference. The three towns were jealous and suspicious, rivals in the struggle for commerce and trade and in consequence antagonistic in their relations.

This was attributed by some to the separateness that comes from having two sets of laws, but the relations of Washington and Georgetown that had the same code of laws were no better than either or both had with Alexandria. It is quite evident the unequal material development of the three towns, the failure of the expectations indulged in by Georgetown and Alexandria as to the benefits that would follow the location of the seat of government, and also, it may be said, changes unfavorable to Georgetown and Alexandria as trade centres, and in the economic conditions of the entire section, had much to do with the political unrest and dissatisfaction.

Congress was blamed because the Potomac ceased to be navigable for sea-going vessels above Alexandria, because the produce of the west came to the seaport at Baltimore by Conestoga wagons instead of using the imperfect navigation of the upper Potomac and encountering the delays of sail navigation on the lower Potomac. It is true that Baltimore had become one of the three main seaports of the country before congress came to the District and that Alexandria and Georgetown had even then begun to decay. Still it was hard to realize that some discrimination had not been practised when the business of the towns did not improve and when the tobacco farm lands selected as the site of the Nation's capital soon became the centre of a population that rapidly outstripped in number both the older towns combined. Besides, where was the bulk of the federal money spent? Certainly not either in Georgetown or in Alexandria. It might seem that the two towns might have found common ground against the capital city. But unfortunately both were struggling for the trade of the country about them and especially of the river, and on this account they were kept apart.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 10, 1820; *City of Washington Gazette*, April 21, 1820.

As stated by Richard Bland Lee, the judge of the orphans' court, who had lived in Alexandria and was then a resident of Washington, "The three towns are at present too incongruous in their feelings to permit a harmonious coöperation in a common government."[1] At this time too was heard what then attracted no attention, but was destined after the lapse of nearly half a century to be revived, and that was an expression of the sense of power of the growing, expanding states of the west. Then it was declared that St. Louis, being the geographical centre of our territory, "it cannot be rationally supposed that Washington City will remain the seat of government for many years. Power is travelling west — the seat of government must travel the same way."[2] The territorial solution of the District problem was attempted by congress in 1826. A hearing was given by the house District committee to representatives of the corporations of the three towns. It was then asserted that both Alexandria and Georgetown were opposed to any change in the government, as they were anxious to go back to the ceding states and were afraid any amelioration of existing conditions might make the people more contented with their present servitude.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 27, 1822. An elaborate house report ten years later opposed a legislature and a delegate on precisely the same grounds. 22d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 337, Feb. 28, 1832.

[2] The same, Aug. 13, 1822. Reprinted from the *Steubenville Herald*.

The citizens of Washington, the committee was told, "would be pleased to receive a form of government which the committee may consider best suited to their interests, based upon the plan that the expenses thereof should be borne by the government in the same manner as in other territories of the United States."[1] Four years later a committee of the house, in trying to ascertain the views of citizens relative to defects of existing laws and the best mode of providing a remedy and especially by means of a code, also included a question as to the reasons for and against the establishment of a territorial form of government.[2] All but two of the nine replies were unfavorable to such a change in the government and only one favored retrocession.

Upon a review of the inequalities and injustices due to the lack of legislative attention to the laws of the District, the committee reached the conclusion that government by congress had been a failure. The remedies of either recession of the territory to the states or providing a local legislature were pronounced to be unconstitutional and impracticable. The committee was "driven to the conclusion that the best remedy" will be the preparation of a code of laws. One of the responses elicited the information that the kind of government was a vexed question with the citizens. Judge Cranch gave it as his opinion that whenever the subject of assuming the legislation of the District had been brought before the people of the District "they have rejected it with great unanimity. Each of the three towns has been afraid of the other two. They preferred to manage their own local concerns by means of their own corporate authorities . . . and to leave the general concerns of the District to the legislation of congress."[3] John

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 20, 1826.

[2] 21st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 269, March 3, 1830. The Powers Report.

[3] The same, p. 106.

Quincy Adams, who had just been succeeded in the presidency by Andrew Jackson and who spent the following spring in Washington, where he had lived for the previous thirteen years and who was the first president to follow Washington's example and acquire property in the city, received one of these communications. He notes in his journal that he did not think a territorial government either necessary or proper. "Among the inhabitants," he adds, "it is a party question."[1] Several months after the report was submitted, which did not discuss the subject of granting the District representation in the house as was done in the case of territories and as had been suggested in the annual message sent by President Jackson to congress at that session, a bill was reported by the house committee to accomplish this very object.[2] But nothing was done by congress. Two years later the people of the town and county of Alexandria voted against retrocession.[3] At the same time the house was informed by the committee on the District that it was well satisfied that a majority of the citizens of the District was opposed to either a local legislature or to a delegate. Still later the editor of the Georgetown newspaper, the *Metropolitan*,[4] while favoring retrocession, if there were not so many obstacles in the way, announced that he believed in the amalgamation of Georgetown with Washington "as the safest, readiest and surest if not the best method that could be devised as a remedy for the languishing condition of the town."

In a further discussion of the subject[5] the editor stated he believed amalgamation "would be a step nearer to retrocession, for it will unite us with those whose opposition would unquestionably defeat any measure of the kind and by giving to all greater means and power would more readily enable us to accomplish such an object."

---

[1] Memoirs, Vol. 8, p. 170, Jan. 15, 1830.

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 3, 1830; also Register of Debates, Dec. 7, 1830, p. 13. At the next session President Jackson renewed this suggestion. The same, Appendix, p. 6.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 26, 1832. House District Committee Report No. 337, 22d Cong., 1st Sess., Feb. 28, 1832. The vote was 419 against any change and 310 favored retrocession.

[4] Reprinted in the *Intelligencer*, Sept. 21, 1835.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 29, 1835.

There is no evidence that this editorial notion found any disciples, but it was not, as far as the union of the two towns was concerned, an original one; for sixteen years before, the writer of a newspaper communication suggested that the two towns be united and Georgetown made Ward No. 1 of Washington city.[1] The citizens of Georgetown did not indorse the view that the way to retrocession was by amalgamation with Washington. But they did not abandon the hope of getting out from under the rule of congress. As that body was informed three years later by resolutions adopted at a public meeting the citizens of Georgetown have learned "from sad experience that congress does not and cannot afford congenial and proper legislation such as their condition and prosperity demands."[2] However, only a bare majority of the qualified voters of the town expressed this opinion when given an opportunity at a special poll.[3] A few weeks later, when the electorate was extended so as to include property holders of the county as well as of the town and also those who paid corporation licenses, the cause apparently did not gain much. Congress gave the matter but little consideration, and even that showed how pervasive the passion of the slavery contest had become. For in the house the chairman of the District committee asked that the committee be discharged from the consideration of the subject, assigning as a reason that it was the wish to avoid a debate on abolition.[4] Whereupon Henry A. Wise of Virginia declared that it was the abolitionists who sought to retain the District for their own purposes, and that it behooved southern men to take the ground for retrocession in order thereby to destroy the last hope of the abolitionist. But the house voted to lay the Georgetown memorial on the table.

As stated, the dissatisfaction with congressional government that was found to exist in the District outside of Washington in 1820 and following years had no doubt an influence in securing from congress needed District legislation. In the year 1826 the charters both of Georgetown and Alexandria were broadened, so as to be better adapted to the changed conditions, carrying out in this respect the policy pursued in the case of Washington, which was given a new charter in 1820. A feature of the latter charter, that was distinctive for a good many years as compared with those of the other two towns, was the election of mayor by popular vote instead of by the city councils.[1] The city government did not escape criticism any more than congress, the principal legislature. In the year 1818, three years after the city fathers voted themselves for the first time a compensation in the form of a per diem pay, it was asserted that the sessions were prolonged by needless discussions in order that the members might draw more money from the city treasury. It was pointed out that neither in Georgetown nor in Alexandria were the members of the city council paid, and yet the service in those towns was better than in Washington.[2] However, as if in vindication of the charge that the sessions of the council were bare and fruitless, the following year an appropriation was made which began the practice of reporting the proceedings in the two city newspapers, the *Intelligencer* and the *City of Washington Gazette*.[3] Whatever personal rivalries and political manœuvres were involved in the annual choice by the city council of a mayor there was on the surface no unseemly contention or failure to make a choice. During the nine years of this period — 1812–1820 —

---

[1] *Intelligencer* May 18, 1818.

[2] 25th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 366, April 10, 1838.

[3] *Intelligencer*, March 7, 1838.

[4] *Congressional Globe*, April 10, 1838, p. 296.

---

[1] Ten years later, by act of March 31, 1830, the mayor of Georgetown was elected by popular vote, while in Alexandria the city councils continued to choose the first municipal officer until 1843. The first mayor elected in Georgetown by popular vote was John Cox, who had served in that capacity since 1822 and who continued to be reëlected every two years from 1831 to 1845. (*Intelligencer*, March 2, 1831.) He had succeeded, at the beginning of his long term of twenty-three years, Henry Foxall, who served from 1819 to 1821. The latter had been preceded by Thomas Corcoran, 1818–1819.

[2] *City of Washington Gazette*, Nov. 11, 1818.

[3] *Intelligencer*, July 3, 1819.

Daniel Rapine served one term, Dr. James H. Blake four, Benjamin G. Orr two, and Samuel N. Smallwood had completed two terms, when by the charter of 1820 the mayor was made elective by the people. Smallwood was chosen by common consent and without opposition.[1] The next election was described as the warmest political contest in the history of the city.[2] It marked the second revolt of the propertyless class. What was known as a poor man's party was organized, and Thomas Carbery was the candidate, while his principal competitor was Roger C. Weightman. In the ward west of 15th Street and in the one south of E Street south, between 10th Street west and 4th Street east, men were allowed to vote whose names were not on the assessment books as required by law.[3] According to the custom of years, the list of qualified voters did not include the names of citizens who had no real property and whose personal property was not valued at more than $100, and therefore liable to a tax of at least fifty cents. But now the matter was brought to an issue by those who claimed the city council had no more right to specify the amount for which a person shall be assessed in order to give him a right to vote than to fix the value of the real estate to enable a voter to be an alderman or mayor.[4] The poor man's party candidate polled more votes than the other three. The city council refused to recognize the legality of the election because of irregularities in some of the wards. For a time it looked as if the city would be without a mayor or council.[5] However, this phase of the situation did not trouble the editor of the *Washington Gazette*. For he said in the contested city council case in 1811, the city got along an entire year without the council just as well as if it had one.[6] A compromise was reached. The city council agreed to induct Mr. Carbery into office, providing he would abide the decision in the case instituted in the circuit court by the city council to test the legality of the election and not take an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.[1] As the result of the legal contest which was prolonged through three jury trials, the election was held to be void.[2] But as there was no charter provision for ordering a new election nothing further was done. However, the Carbery administration at once proceeded to carry out the principles which it represented and placed on the assessment books the names of citizens, many of whom, it was asserted, had no property except their wearing apparel. The new party, however, did not control the council, and when it was learned what was being done with the assessment lists, then an ordinance was passed to give what was only a custom, the sanction of a positive enactment by prohibiting the enrolment of the name of any citizen whose personal property did not exceed in value $100. The mayor, however, refused to sign it, and the $100 bill became an issue in the next city election.[3] At that time the poor man's party lost their representative in the mayor's office. Mr. Carbery was defeated, and the bill that had been the bone of contention was signed by Samuel N. Smallwood, who had defeated Mr. Carbery and was again at the head of the city government.[4] At the end of six months, owing to the death of the mayor, the council elected Roger C. Weightman, so that the old régime was restored, and what is more the vulnerable point of attack had been made secure. It was the second time that an effort had been made to expand the electorate. In the year 1811, apparently influenced by the recent action of the Maryland legislature in providing free white manhood suffrage and taking advantage of the absence in the city charter of any requirement of an assessment of taxes made previous to the election, the male inmates of the poorhouse were brought to the polls and there and then taxed twenty-five cents, which was paid by the candidate or his friends and their votes received.[1] As stated, this election was contested, and the council thus elected was not seated and the city was without a local legislature for one year. Appeal was made to congress, and by the act of 1812 election day "25 cent votes" were made impossible, as the qualifications of voters were changed so that no one could vote unless he had been assessed on the books of the corporation at least two months prior to the day of election. When the next change in the charter was made in 1820, this requirement was still further strengthened, as congress increased the time from two to five months.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 5, 1822. Towards the close of his term the mayor's office was removed to the new city hall.

[2] The same, June 5, 1822.

[3] *Washington Gazette*, June 12, 1822.

[4] *Intelligencer*, June 6 and 24, 1825.

[5] The same, June 16, 1822. 19th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 83, Feb. 22, 1826.

[6] June 13, 1822.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 16, 1822.

[2] The same, Jan. 13, 1823. Also House District Committee Report No. 83, 19th Cong., 1st Sess., Feb. 22, 1826.

[3] The same, June 6, 1825.

[4] The same, June 8, 1824; Ordinance, July 7, 1824.

While the "25 cent votes" and "the $100 bill" represent entirely different political methods, yet it is quite evident they both demonstrated the feeling of unrest that prevailed in a community where it was asserted the government was in the hands of "a moneyed aristocracy." Making due allowance for the rhetoric, the fact remained that at the city election in 1822 only 15 per cent of the entire white male population, the only class from which voters could come, and only 5 per cent of the whole population, voted.[2]

The $100 bill advocates did not take their defeat as final, but made an appeal to congress protesting against the law which deprived many of the right to vote. They also proposed a draft of a bill doing away with all property qualifications.[3] The relief asked for was not granted. Five years later a meeting of citizens opposed to this law was called,[4] which ended for the time the effort made on behalf of what might for that period be described as modernizing the franchise in the Nation's capital and which was not finally accomplished until seventeen years later.[1] Quite different was the course pursued in regard to the ward boundaries which had been laid off by the city council in accordance with the charter requirements of 1820, so that each of the six wards should, as near as possible, contain an equal population, as they were given equal representation in the city council. The growth of the population disturbed this balance. At the end of ten years the first three wards, comprising the section from Rock Creek and the Potomac to 1st Street west and to south E Street, contained 70 per cent of the entire population and paid 78 per cent of the taxes.[2] Efforts were made to induce the city councils to adopt a new ward arrangement so as to represent the population more equally in the membership of the councils. But nothing was done. The populous wards appealed to congress,[3] where they were met with a protest from the other three wards,[4] which were fearful if they were outnumbered in the city councils a system of taxation would be imposed ruinous to those who held large unimproved possessions in those wards. The influence of the three poorer wards was strong enough to prevent the proposed action, but was unable to correct a still more serious defect by which the revenue from real and personal taxes could only be expended in the ward where the property was located. Under such a system the unequal development of the various sections deprived a large part of the city from much of the benefit that comes from an increase in city revenues. More than a decade passed before any change or improvement in this particular was attempted by the city council. A longer period passed before the restrictions on the franchise were removed. Yet during this interval, some eight years before 1840, one after the other of the states changed their franchise requirements, doing away especially with property qualifications both for voters and office-holders.[1] At this time, too, what was looked upon as the reign of the common people had begun; for Andrew Jackson was in the White House and "the Jackson candidate," John P. Van Ness, had just entered upon his second term as mayor of the city.[2] He followed Joseph Gales,[3] one of the proprietors of the *Intelligencer*, that had opposed the election of Andrew Jackson. His last year in office practically coincided with that of the first year of the Jackson administration that brought to the city, for the first time in nearly a third of a century, the suspense and alarm as well as the changes that come in the wake of a political upheaval. Mr. Gales was not a candidate when the time of the biennial city election came in 1830, but his paper declared that then for the first time national politics became a factor in that local event.[4] Three candidates were in the field. Two of them were bank presidents: William A. Bradley, president of the Patriotic Bank, who represented the anti-Jackson element in the Democratic party that soon was to form a new organization known as the Whig party, and John P. Van Ness, president of the Bank of the Metropolis, who in 1828 was active in the organization of the Jackson central committee of Washington, which was not continued after the campaign.[5] The third candidate was George Sweeney, then conducting a claim business, but subsequently chief clerk of the post-office department and so also apparently a Jackson man. The two Jackson men got more than 70 per cent of the vote, and as Van Ness outran Sweeney by 53 votes and Bradley by 63 votes he was declared elected.[6] At the end of his first term he was again a candidate, but opposed to him was Thomas Munroe, who after a service of thirty years as postmaster of the city had been removed by the Jackson administration a few months after the inauguration.[1] As indicating the change in the political sentiment of the town, Van Ness, as the representative of the administration, received about 50 per cent of the vote as compared with 70 per cent which the Jackson men had polled two years before. He had only a majority of 13 votes.[2] The partisan feeling ran so high that it was impossible for the two parties to unite as citizens as usual in the observance of the national anniversary. Beginning in 1831, party observances of the day were held, the Jackson men having their oration and dinner and the National Republicans, or Whigs, as they came to be called, having their own celebration.[3] Not only were the political and social relations of the citizens affected, but also in 1834, at the end of the second term of Van Ness, the city, unable to meet even the interest on the canal debt, was asking the help of congress. Then "the folly of the District relying as it does on the general government for relief in its present embarrassments in making national party questions an issue in local elections" was pointed out. "Let the people of the states manage the Republic," it was urged. "The proper course is to select a candidate not on party lines and then the result of the election will not be a triumph for either party. The city can be saved only by the kind and cordial coöperation of every friend it possesses in the national legislature." [4] On the other hand, the Whigs were urged to show "that even here, within the purlieus of the palace, the sons of freemen are the inheritors of their fathers' principles." [5] These considerations as well as the waning power of the Jackson men had an influence in the mayoralty election of 1834. The Jackson candidate, Thomas Carbery,

---

[1] 19th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 83, Feb. 22, 1826.

[2] The total vote cast for the four candidates was 729, while the census of 1820 gave the number of white males in the city as 4786. Ten years later the white males were 6581, and 928 votes were cast in the mayoralty election. (*Intelligencer*, June 8, 1830.) Besides the qualification of color, citizenship, mature age and residence, to be a city voter it was required to be a free-holder or assessed in personal property to the amount of $100 (tax rate fifty cents), and in addition all the personal taxes must be paid up to the time of the election. No change was made until 1848, when all property qualifications were removed except a school tax of one dollar annually.

[3] 19th Cong., 1st Sess., House Report No. 83, Feb. 22, 1826.

[4] The same, June 22, 1831.

---

[1] The franchise in the other two towns was equally limited, while in the two counties the citizens had never had a chance to exercise the elective franchise.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 15, 1831.

[3] The same, April 25, 1832.

[4] The same, Nov. 21, 1831.

---

[1] McMaster, Vol. 7, p. 163.

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 19, 1834.

[3] Mr. Gales was elected in 1827 by the city council to fill the unexpired term of Mr. Weightman, who was chosen for a full term in 1826, and who the next year resigned to become the cashier of the Bank of Washington. In 1828 Mr. Gales was elected for a two-year term.

[4] May 19, 1834.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 21, 1840.

[6] The same, June 8, 1830.

---

[1] Dr. William Jones, a practising physician, whose wife was the daughter of Thomas Corcoran, Sr., of Georgetown, succeeded Mr. Munroe and continued in the office to March 23, 1839. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 6, p. 170.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 6, 1832. Van Ness received 505 votes and Munroe 492.

[3] The same, July 4, 1831.

[4] The same, May 14, 1834.

[5] The same, May 14, 1834. Resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Whigs of the 3d Ward.

the ex-mayor, and then holding the federal office of inspector of revenue and deputy collector of customs for the city of Washington, withdrew.[1] Peter Force, the Whig candidate, remained in the field, while a less pronounced partisan, William A. Bradley, who was described as "said to be a Whig," [2] was put up and was elected,[3] so that the partisanship of the city election of 1830 had disappeared in four years, or perhaps more correctly the desperate financial straits of the city government had proven to be more vital than the triumph of political parties.

At the end of Mr. Bradley's term, although Jackson was still in power and five years were to elapse before William Henry Harrison, the candidate of the new party, came to the White House, the Whig succession was more positively continued, as Peter Force was elected. Two years later he was chosen for a second term "without opposition." [4] Then came William W. Seaton, the other proprietor of the *Intelligencer*, and also a Whig, who for a decade by successive elections served as mayor.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 19, 1834. He had been given that place by President Adams two years after his term as mayor ended. The same, June 13, 1826.

[2] The same, June 4, 1834.

[3] The same, June 4, 1834. The vote is given by wards. Bradley received 546 and Force 442.

[4] The same, June 5, 1838.

CHAPTER VIII

NEWSPAPERS AS POLITICAL ORGANS

The change in conditions which rent the dominant political party into warring factions and led to the election in 1829 of Andrew Jackson, the man of the people, had a radical effect on Washington newspapers. For there, during the first sixteen years of the existence of the city, the *National Intelligencer* had been the sole organ of the party in power, the mouthpiece of the successive Democratic administrations. At that period and for some years later that position did not carry with it all the government printing. The *Intelligencer* did some, while the rest was distributed among the Democratic printers who, like Duane, set up shops in the Nation's capital without, however, the appendage of a newspaper.

It was not until the spring of 1816 when the successor of Mr. Madison was being discussed that a beginning was made of providing at the Nation's capital a newspaper in the interests of candidates for the presidency. The *Intelligencer*, the administration organ, expressed the views of President Madison in favoring James Monroe, the secretary of state. But the *Washington City Weekly Gazette*, that had gone down as a daily in the destruction of the city and emerged as a weekly more than a year later, with Jonathan Elliot as the printer and publisher, came out in favor of the nomination of William H. Crawford of Georgia, the secretary of war.[1]

The congressional caucus, in exercising for the last time the functions of a nominating convention, preferred Monroe over Crawford, and this action was ratified at the polls. But Crawford did not abandon his presidential aspirations. He remained in the cabinet under the new administration as secretary of the treasury. His newspaper, the *Gazette*, with the help, no doubt, of the department printing, prospered, and a few months after Mr. Monroe entered upon his first term began its career as a daily.[1] Two years later the publisher purchased the *National Register*, a weekly that had been in existence three years, a part of the time under the editorial control of George Watterston, the librarian of congress, and continued its publication.[2] At the close of Monroe's first term the acquiescence in his serving another term was so general that he was elected practically without opposition. Then the factional differences in the Democratic party became more pronounced. A struggle between party leaders for the prize of the presidency ensued. A little more than a year of Monroe's second term had passed when the *Washington Republican* made its appearance in the interests of John C. Calhoun, the secretary of war.[3] The editor of the new paper, Thomas L. McKenney, who, as superintendent of the Indian trade, was a subordinate in the war department, established his office in the row on Pennsylvania Avenue near 21st Street, occupied in part by the Franklin Hotel,[4] and proceeded to engage in a lively interchange with the *Gazette*, the organ of the secretary of the treasury. By that time the *Intelligencer* was regarded as also favoring the Crawford candidacy. A year after the *Republican* made its appearance, another organ was announced, the *National Journal*, a semi-weekly devoted to the candidacy of another member of the cabinet, John Quincy Adams, the secretary of state.[5] It, however, did not actually appear until a year later. The editor, Peter Force, a practical printer, nine years before had followed to this city from New York his employer, William A. Davis, who had given up his printing business in that city and removed to Washington in order to carry out a contract which he had secured to do the printing of congress. Mr. Force worked for Mr. Davis in his Washington establishment.[1] After the Davis establishment was sold, together with the printing contract, the firm of Davis and Force was formed and a stationery and book store was opened. Mr. Force early showed a bent as a historical collector and editor, and two years before he became a newspaper publisher he printed the first volume of the National Calendar and Annals of the United States. It was designed to be a statistical manual of the United States, and while much material of that sort was printed, many pages were occupied with lists of government employés, the Blue Book in condensed form. This publication was continued annually from 1820 to 1836 except for the first three years of the Adams administration, when presumably Mr. Force's position as editor of the organ of the administration prevented his giving attention to this work.[2]

---

[1] *Washington City Weekly Gazette*, Feb. 24, 1816. The office was on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 6th and 7th streets. Mr. Elliot was a native of Warwick, Scotland, and came to this country in 1810.

---

[1] *Washington City Weekly Gazette*, Oct. 11, 1817. In the issue of Feb. 15, 1821, the name was changed to *Washington Gazette*.

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 31, 1819. The file of the *Register* in the library of congress is March 2, 1816–1820.

[3] The same, June 12, 1822. To begin Aug. 7th as an evening paper twice a week. Adams, Vol. 6, pp. 47 and 60, July 28 and Sept. 9, 1822.

[4] The same, May 23, 1823.

[5] The same, Aug. 16, 1823. The first issue was dated Aug. 9, 1823. Adams, Vol. 6, p. 407. Issued from the printing-office of Davis and Force.

A feature of the calendar was a description of the city of Washington, which served as a general guide and which gives it a place as the second book of the sort.[3]

The *Republican*, the Calhoun paper, had a struggling existence, and at the close of the first year, Mr. McKenney sold it, and before another twelve months passed it ceased to appear, having failed to pay expenses from the beginning.[4]

The establishment was purchased by Peter Force, the publisher of the *National Journal.* In the course of a few weeks, and in the midst of the presidential campaign of 1824, the *Journal* began its career as a daily.[1] A few weeks before the election, and while three of the five presidential candidates had newspaper organs at the Nation's capital, a prospectus of the *American Mercury* was issued, a newspaper to champion the cause of Henry Clay.[2] But this project did not materialize, so that Clay as well as Jackson was not supplied at the Nation's capital with one of the requisites of that period for a presidential canvass. Seven months after the *Republican* went out of existence and Mr. Calhoun had been elected vice-president, a committee of the house of representatives called on Mr. Adams at his residence, 1333 F Street, and notified him of his election by that body as president of the United States. That evening he was serenaded by a band of musicians, while throughout the town where the adherents of Jackson and Crawford gathered only rage and disappointment were expressed over what was denounced as a bargain between Adams and Clay to bring about the former's election by the house. So strong was the feeling that for a time it looked as if the citizens would not be able to unite in arranging for the inaugural ball. For the first time on such an occasion rival organizations were threatened. Separate meetings were held and two sets of ball managers were appointed.[3] Finally, however, the two committees were merged and the arrangements for the ball were completed. The marshal of the District, Tench Ringgold, was again intrusted with official details of the inaugural arrangements. On the morning of the 4th of March six military companies of the city were drawn up on F Street, in the vicinity of 14th, and about the residence of Mr. Adams were grouped citizens. Presently the carriage of the president of the United States brought him to the scene. Then Mr. Adams, accompanied by Samuel L. Southard, the secretary of the navy, and William Wirt, the attorney-general, who continued in these positions under the new administration, entered the president elect's carriage and escorted by the militia and citizens proceeded to the capitol. After delivering the inaugural in the house and being sworn in, the president returned to his residence under the same escort.[1] He found his house crowded with people who had come to extend their congratulations. After holding a reception, the president hastened to the White House, where he joined in the throng that were passing in to say good-by to the ex-president. In the evening the president attended the inaugural ball, which for the first time was not held in a hotel. Instead, the Washington Assembly Rooms, in a building designed by George Hadfield and erected by Lewis Carusi, on the site of the old Washington Theatre, at the northeast corner of 11th and C streets northwest, was the scene of this gathering. The largest place of the kind in the District, it had never before been available, as it was not built and opened until the fall of 1822.[2] The president remained at his F Street residence for some three weeks, or until his predecessor, who had been detained in the White House by the illness of Mrs. Monroe, went to his home in Loudoun County, Va. He was escorted to the District line by the militia companies and citizens.[3] Mr. Crawford, who, with General Jackson, had the more or less disturbing experience of a near approach to the goal of the presidency only to be swept to one side in the uncertain currents of the balloting in the house, declined the invitation of his successful rival, Mr. Adams, to remain in the cabinet. His health was poor, and he decided to return to his home in Georgia, and, as it proved, retire from active politics.[4] But the enthusiasm which had won such a large vote for General Jackson, stirred to still greater fervor by the charges that its idol had been robbed of his right by a corrupt bargain, and that the will of the people had been defeated and "the dynasty of the secretaries" had triumphed, began at once to organize for the next quadrennial contest. Hardly a year of Adams' term had gone when the former Crawford organ, the *Washington Gazette,* was purchased in the interests of the Jackson candidacy. It was said at the time that John H. Eaton and associates were the purchasers.[1] On the 6th of February the paper appeared as the *United States Telegraph,* with John S. Meehan as publisher.[2] The following fall, Duff Green, who was practising law in St. Louis, came on in the interests of Jackson and took charge of the paper. Meehan remained as an employé and then when Jackson came in he was appointed librarian of congress. In the course of a year the paper made such a record as an anti-administration organ that President Adams looked upon it as "a scurrilous and abusive print."[3] In attacking the administration and lauding General Jackson, the *Telegraph* displayed an energy and vivacity that had not been equalled in the District press since the days of the *Federal Republican.* In a few weeks the *Alexandria Herald,* a tri-weekly, ceased to appear, and its subscription list was turned over to the *Telegraph.*[4] Apparently the benefit was not great, as the *Herald* was not prosperous, and with its discontinuance Alexandria became a one-newspaper town.[5] Still, small or large,

---

[1] Three years after coming to Washington Mr. Force issued a prospectus of the *American Quarterly Review* to be devoted to politics and literature. (*Intelligencer*, Jan. 3, 1818.) Ten years later a quarterly bearing the same name but under different auspices was issued. (Notice of the fifth number, *Intelligencer*, March 7, 1828.)

[2] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 2. Life of Peter Force.

[3] The first was Davis' Columbian Calendar, 1814.

[4] Adams, Vol. 6, p. 291, April 13, 1824; *Intelligencer*, July 12, 1824. Last issue of the *Republican* July 10.

---

[1] Adams, Vol. 6, p. 407, Aug. 7, 1824. Mention of the first appearance of the paper as a daily.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 5, 1824.

[3] The same, Feb. 19, 25 and 26, 1825.

---

[1] Adams, Vol. 6, p. 518, March 4, 1825.

[2] *Washington Gazette*, Sept. 9, 1822. The main entrance was from C Street. On the first floor was a dining-room and on the second the ball-room, 80 × 48 feet, with a ceiling 22 feet high.

[3] *Intelligencer*, March 23, 1825.

[4] He had been a resident of the city since 1807 with the exception of two years. Prior to 1820 he lived for a time in a house on the east side of Delaware Avenue between B and C streets (*Intelligencer*, Nov. 17, 1820) and then at the northwest corner of Massachusetts Avenue and 14th Street, with grounds about it comprising nearly the entire square.

---

[1] Adams, Vol. 7, p. 113, and Vol. 8, p. 217.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 7, 1826. In the *Gazette* of Feb. 2, 1826, Mr. Meehan is spoken of as the purchaser. At that time in connection with Robert Anderson he was publishing the *Columbian Star* under the auspices of the Baptist denomination.

[3] Adams, Vol. 7, p. 367, Dec. 4, 1827. The office of the *Telegraph* and residence of the proprietor was on the north side of E Street, a short distance east of 10th Street northwest.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 17, 1826. Last appearance of the *Alexandria Herald*, Nov. 16.

[5] The *Alexandria Gazette*, its name changed to the *Phenix Gazette* (S. Snowden and W. F. Thornton, proprietors), occupied the field and was issued tri-weekly.

the transfer of the subscription list to the *Telegraph* was a help in the struggle for existence in the newspaper field of Washington.[1] What had been attempted in the case of the *Washington Republican* in 1824 to procure a larger share of the government printing[2] and had succeeded to some extent in the case of the *Washington Gazette* a year later[3] was even still more successful in 1827, because then Duff Green was chosen by the senate to be its printer. In a measure, the progress of the section of the Democratic party that stood behind Andrew Jackson may be traced in the success of the *Telegraph* in drawing to its establishment this important part of the government printing. Two years later, and upon the assembling of the congress that had been swept into power on the tidal wave of the Jackson victory, the house followed the example of the senate and chose Duff Green to do its printing. The *Telegraph* had been a power in the campaign. To overcome its influence the opposition had resorted to a new device for Washington in establishing a newspaper for the campaign only. It was a weekly with the title "We the People" and was edited by Jonathan Elliot, one of the veteran newspaper publishers in Washington.[4] Its utterances were in the same incisive style that marked the pages of the *Gazette*, or as it seemed to the editor of the *Telegraph* "We the People blackguardism." The *Telegraph* shouldered its opponents out of the way with the exception of the *Intelligencer*. For four years the *Intelligencer* had seen its place as administration organ taken by the *National Journal*, and now it lost what remained of the public printing. Ever since the passage of the law of March 3, 1818, substituting for the contract system the employment of a printer to do the work according to a scale of prices fixed by law, Gales and Seaton had held, by election of both houses, the post of printer.

---

[1] It was probably not financial reasons as much as the change in the news supply that led Duff Green to adopt the expedient of issuing his paper in the afternoon when congress was not in session. *U. S. Telegraph*, March 5, 1829.

[2] Adams, Vol. 6, p. 228, Jan. 6, 1824.

[3] The same, Vol. 7, p. 81, Dec. 15, 1825.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 7, 1828.

A few months after receiving this lucrative employment the *Intelligencer* establishment was removed from Pennsylvania Avenue, where it had been since 1801, to a leased building erected for its use at the northwest corner of 7th and D streets northwest, which became its permanent home.[1] Shortly after the second inauguration of General Jackson, a lean period for an anti-administration paper, the building was sold at public auction and bought by the United States Bank.[2] This circumstance was not overlooked by Duff Green, and a year later, as a feature of the fierce campaign against the United States Bank, it was made a basis of the assertion in the *Telegraph* that the *Intelligencer* was fed by the bank.[3] The *Intelligencer* indignantly denied the insinuation that the relation of tenant to "the monster," as Jackson was in the habit of describing the institution, also carried with it the editorial independence of the paper. The condition was, however, disclosed that while Gales and Seaton, from 1801 to 1816, had occupied the field exclusively as the administration organ, yet they had not freed themselves from debt. For besides not owning the *Intelligencer* building, a deed of trust was carried on the printing plant. Both editors had houses in the city, but as early as 1815 Mr. Gales purchased a farm on the northeast bounds of the city. Fifteen years later the only house on the place was a one-story frame which was not finished.

In later years the affairs of the two newspaper proprietors had so prospered that they became the owners of the building occupied by the *Intelligencer*. Mr. Seaton dispensed an agreeable hospitality at his commodious residence on the south side of E Street between 7th and 8th streets northwest, while Mr. Gales erected on his farm a comfortable country residence which became noted in the social annals of the time as Eckington.

After making due allowance for the personal equation, it may be concluded from the financial condition of the *Intelligencer*, after nearly two decades as the exclusive organ at the capital of the dominant party, and doing a large part of the public printing, that government patronage did not at that period yield a lucrative harvest. In fact, the use of the printing-press in the administrative and legislative work of the government was of slow growth. For the first third of the nineteenth century the printing business, although larger than any one industry carried on in the city, was precarious, mainly because it was so limited in amount that it could be done while congress was in session. During the recess the plants were partially shut down and the printers obliged to seek work elsewhere. When, in 1829, the *Intelligencer* was cut off from all revenue from public printing, it had a resource which it managed to hold on to for nearly a decade, mainly because its competitors did not have the facilities for doing the work.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 14, 1818.

[2] The same, Jan. 9, 1834.

[3] The same, Sept. 15, 1830, and Jan. 9, 1834.

In the closing years of the Monroe administration Gales and Seaton, at their own risk and expense, entered upon a novel undertaking, the first attempt made to publish in separate form the debates of congress. As they later explained, the work was undertaken "under the excitement of the fresh impulse given to national feeling by the visit of Lafayette to this country." [1] Of the debates in congress for the preceding thirty-five years no record had been made, except such as might be found in the columns of the newspapers or in the note-books of stenographers, or an occasional publication in book form of a condensed account of the proceedings of a single session or of an entire congress.[2]

As explained in the preface of the first volume of the Register "the debates are not in all cases literally reported" and when "the proceedings are not of general interest, they are not preserved." The exercise of such discretion did not fail to bring down on the heads of the editors the sharp criticism of those whose remarks were left out or abridged. However, in spite of such a cause for dissatisfaction, at the close of the congress, following the issue of the Register, public aid was secured and then a subscription was made by each house for 500 copies at $5 per copy. For many years the newspapers of the country relied upon the *Intelligencer* for what they printed of the proceedings of the two houses.[1] When congress sat in Philadelphia, only two newspaper reporters attended the sessions. At that time the custom, begun in New York, of providing seats on the floor of the house near the speaker for the use of the representatives of the press was given up, owing to the limited space.[2] At the second session held in Washington the house directed that places on the floor for stenographers or reporters be assigned by the speaker.[3] Eleven years later but four newspapers were represented in the house. For many years Samuel H. Smith, who was a stenographer, furnished the congressional reports for his paper, the *Intelligencer*. He had the assistance later on of Mr. Gales, and then for many years, Gales and Seaton, both stenographers, occupied a seat at the side of the vice-president and of the speaker, and also as one of the perquisites shared with those officials in the use of the official snuff-box.[4] When, however, the Democratic party began to go to pieces and factions arose, instead of relying on other newspapers for the reports of the doings of congress, the leading papers began to send their representatives to attend the sessions. As the exciting contest of 1824 drew near, infused, as it was, with the all-pervasive enthusiasm for Andrew Jackson, it was found that "a dozen or two" stenographers were reporting congressional proceedings. What is now known as the "Press Gallery" may be said to have had its birth about the year 1823, and the progress in the development of this feature of public life may be gauged somewhat by the comment made some six years later, that "the letters written from Washington, and published in different parts of the country, are becoming more and more numerous. . . . We occasionally obtain from these sources the first information of what is going on in our neighborhood."[1] This period witnessed not alone the birth of the party press in Washington, but at the same time the city became a centre from which was supplied, through special correspondents, news and gossip to newspapers throughout the country. As Washington increased in importance as a centre of political newspapers, Georgetown, that previous to the War of 1812 was looked upon as a desirable location for such publications, fell into the background. With the removal to Baltimore of the *Federal Republican*, a little more than a year after peace had been declared, the town was left not only without a partisan press, but without a newspaper of any sort. But the latter condition continued only about a week, and then the *National Messenger* began to appear twice a week.[2] The paper was published by James C. Dunn, the partner in the firm of W. A. Rind and Co., the former publishers of the *Federalist* and the owners of one of the oldest printing plants in the District.[3] For four years the *Messenger* supplied the town with its news, and then business troubles overtook Mr. Dunn, resulting in the dissolution of the firm of Rind and Co. The *Messenger* continued for a few months longer, and then gave way to the *Metropolitan*, a tri-weekly, after a competition which lasted about a year.[4] The publisher of the *Metropolitan* was William A. Rind, Jr. In the course of six years it was succeeded by another Rind paper, the *Columbian*, Samuel S. Rind, publisher.[1]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 24, 1843. The title of this publication was Register of Debates, covering the period 1828–1838.

[2] This material was in later years collected by Gales and Seaton and published in the series, the Annals of Congress, beginning with the publication in 1843 of the proceedings of the first congress.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 28, 1821.

[2] Annals of Congress, Dec. 9, 1800, p. 816.

[3] The same, Jan. 7, 1802, p. 406.

[4] William Winston Seaton, p. 151.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 19, 1829. According to the reminiscences of James Gordon Bennett, Sr., he was the first to give the business of letter-writing from Washington "its present light and amusing character in a series of letters published in the *New York Enquirer* in the years 1827–1828. Before that period a Washington letter-writer simply gave the dull details of both houses, the abstracts of reports or a few sketches of the speakers." Journalism in the United States, p. 286.

[2] *Intelligencer*, April 12, 1816.

[3] At first located on Jefferson Street between 30th and 31st streets south of M Street, the printing-office had been removed after the war to Wisconsin Avenue north of M Street, taking possession of the building occupied for so many years by the large book-store of Joseph Milligan. *Intelligencer*, June 28, 1815; also Aug. 8, 1820. Advt. of W. A. Rind.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 28, 1820. First issue of the *Metropolitan*, Jan. 19, 1820. The library of congress file of the *Messenger* is from April 17, 1816 to May 21, 1821; of the *Metropolitan*, Jan. 20, 1820–Dec. 9, 1826.

The money appropriated for new furniture and furnishings for the White House was expended in the spring of 1825, under the personal direction of Mr. Adams, who had no notion, after Mr. Monroe's experience with that fund, of intrusting it to other hands. In addition to the articles of household use and ornaments paid for out of the public money, Mr. Adams placed in the house a billiard table which was his own property.[2] As it happened, the billiard table was included in an inventory of the furniture of the house that was sent to congress and printed. At once the opponents of the administration, who from the very outset were both alert and unscrupulous in finding causes of criticism, did not allow such an opportunity to pass. The use of public money in the purchase of "a gaming table" was denounced on the floor of the house.[1] Although then in his fifty-eighth year, Mr. Adams resumed, when summer came, the practice of several years past of beginning the day by swimming in the Potomac. He rose at five o'clock, and accompanied by the steward of his household, a Swiss, whom he had brought from Europe, walked to the banks of the Potomac near the mouth of the Tiber, west of 17th Street, and leaving his clothes on the shore, swam sometimes as far as the Long Bridge, a distance of about three-quarters of a mile, and without resting, returned. On one occasion, previous to this time, he was an hour and a half in the water without touching the ground. At times he swam across the river. After the first season in the White House he substituted for this form of daily exercise a brisk walk to the capitol or to Georgetown.[2] The social customs of the White House were maintained, and following, as he states, the practice of his predecessors, Mr. Adams declined invitations to private social functions. Mrs. Adams held her first drawing-room about the middle of December, 1825. The stateliness and reserve of the Monroe régime were replaced by the coldness and, as some thought, haughtiness of the Adams. The usual reception was given on New Year's day following. At that time the crowd of visitors overflowed into the east room, which had never been furnished. In this way public attention was called to its barren condition.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 26, 1826. A list of the minor periodicals during the period of 1815–1828, prepared from the notices found in the *Intelligencer*, includes only those mentioned as actually published and not those of which only announcements are found, and is as follows: —

Washington Theological Repository. (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 2, 1819.)

American Critic and General Review. (*Intelligencer*, April 7, 1820.) Devoted to literature, science and art.

Mrs. A. S. Colvin's *Weekly Messenger.* First issue June 15. (*Washington Gazette*, June 24, 1822.) Publication suspended. (*Intelligencer*, Sept. 17, 1822.) Resumed. (The same, June 15, 1826.) Library of congress file, Sept. 8, 1827–March 29, 1828.

National Palladium. Weekly, James Wilson, publisher.

Washington Sentinel. Weekly, printed by James Wilson for L. S. Burr. (The same, Oct. 30, 1823.)

Washington Quarterly Magazine for July. Robert Little, editor. (The same, Aug. 2, 1823.) Containing specifications of patents illustrated by plates.

American Quarterly Review. No. 5, for March, 1825. Pishey Thompson. (The same, March 2, 1828.)

Columbian Register. Weekly, J. L. Skinner. Library of congress file, Jan. 5, 1828–Dec. 26, 1829.

Washington City Chronicle and Literary Repository. Weekly, A. Rothwell and T. W. Ustick. Library of congress file, March 14, 1828–Dec. 26, 1829.

Mirror of the Patent Office. J. L. Skinner. (*Intelligencer*, May 20, 1828.)

[2] Adams, Vol. 7, p. 21, May 30, 1825; McMaster, Vol. 5, p. 502.

It was proposed in congress to make an appropriation to furnish the room. The effort was renewed at successive sessions, but a hostile majority blocked this measure, as it did many others which were thought to be favored by or favorable to Mr. Adams. Although it was explained that it would be of no benefit to Mr. Adams personally to have this room furnished, as it would add to his household expenses, still congress could not be induced to provide the money. At the same time, one of the speakers, judging from the comments he had read on the subject of appropriating $25,000 for furnishing one room, had come to the conclusion that the public mind was not prepared for it. On the other hand, it was urged, the house had been provided at public expense and ought to be completed. One speaker expressed his willingness to go as far as to vote money to heat and light it, and thus relieve the president from that expense.[1] At the opening of the last social season of the Adams administration the east room, "never opened before and now not finished, was thrown open for dancing, a thing unheard of before at a drawing-room."[2] But the front of the house without the portico, and the grounds to the south still in the confusion of an uncared-for place, were allowed to remain unchanged until General Jackson came there to live.

---

[1] Annals of Congress, May 17, 1826, p. 2655.

[2] Memoirs, Vol. 7, pp. 21 and 66.

An habitual church-goer, the accession to the presidency made no change in that respect for Mr. Adams.[3] It was not uncommon for him to go twice to church on Sunday. In the morning he might hear a sermon of Rev. Robert Little, the pastor of the Unitarian Church at the northeast corner of 6th and D streets northwest, and then in the afternoon walk across Lafayette Park to St. John's Episcopal Church, where the rector, Rev. William Hawley, conducted the services, or attend the preaching of Rev. Daniel Baker, the pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, which stood at the apex of the western triangular square formed at the intersection of New York Avenue and H Street northwest. A marked change had taken place in the church facilities of the city during the eight years Mr. Adams had served as secretary of state. The year before he came to the city, in 1817, the edifice of St. John's Church, designed by B. H. Latrobe, in the form of a Greek cross, its gray stucco walls finished with a lantern and a cupola, had been built, and Rev. William Hawley had just been chosen rector in place of Rev. William H. Wilmer, the first rector. There Mr. Madison had occupied one of the high-backed square pews that bordered the aisles, paved with brick, and there, too, Mr. Monroe worshipped.[1] In the course of three years an era of church building and enlargement began. For in the year 1820 the west transept of St. John's Church was extended to 16th Street, and its pillared porch and steeple were built. The Second Presbyterian Church was organized as the result of a movement begun in the spring of 1818.[2] Three years later the congregation took possession of its new meeting-house,[3] having six months previously called as their pastor Rev. Mr. Baker. Mr. Adams became an attendant, and less than two years after the church edifice was in use, he was elected a member of the board of trustees and held the position five years, three of which were during his term as president. During this period, as one of the members of the board records, and as was characteristic of Mr. Adams, he "was the most attentive member of the board."[4] One of the methods of church financing at that period was the sale of pews, and Mr. Adams contributed in that way to the erection of the church. A balance of $1200 of indebtedness due the builder remained unpaid, and as the congregation was unable to raise the money and foreclosure was threatened, Mr. Adams came to the relief by making a loan.

---

[1] Register of Debates, p. 1317, Jan. 23, 1827.

[2] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 248. December, 1828.

[3] A little over a year after the inauguration he made a public confession of faith and was received into the membership of the Congregational Church in Quincy, Mass.

During the last year of his term in the White House a meeting of the congregation was held to choose a successor to the pastor, who had resigned. Mr. Adams attended the meeting and stayed throughout, taking part in the proceedings.[5] He has left no record of his impressions of that meeting, which was evidently one of suppressed if not expressed feeling. The supporters of Rev. J. N. Danforth, who failed to receive a majority of the votes, withdrew to the number of twenty from the membership of the church, and organized the Fourth Presbyterian Church. In the meantime, Rev. Luther Halsey of Princeton, N. J., who received a majority of the votes of the congregation, declined the call, and Rev. John N. Campbell, the youthful assistant of Rev. Dr. Balch of Georgetown, became the pastor of the church.

---

[1] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 12, p. 93.

[2] *Intelligencer*, April 15 and 20, 1818. A church organization was formed Oct. 13, 1820. Presbytery of Washington and its Churches, p. 41.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 21, 1821.

[4] The same, Sept. 27, 1828. Statement of James H. Handy, secretary of the congregation.

[5] The same.

Mr. Campbell entertained decided views in regard to Mrs. Eaton, which he expressed freely to a brother clergyman who lived in New York, and who gave his version of the affair publicity. General Jackson summoned both clergymen to an interview, and one result was the president was seen no more at the church, and the pastor speedily accepted a call to a church in Albany, N. Y.[1] On the 1st of March of 1829, eight months after the decisive meeting of the Second Church congregation, a frame building 40×50 feet, erected by the Fourth Church on the east side of 9th Street between G and H streets, was dedicated. For a decade it was the church home, or until a brick edifice was erected on the opposite side of the street.[2] Mr. Adams liked the discourses of Rev. Mr. Little, who was one of the notable preachers of the day in Washington and was chosen pastor of the first Unitarian church formed in the District.

More than two years before a church was organized religious meetings were held in a schoolroom on the south side of M Street near 28th Street, conducted by John Wright, the principal of the school.[3] A year later a similar movement was started in Washington, which, unlike the Georgetown effort, had permanent results. From the outset the purpose of those that called and attended the first meetings in R. Shaer's schoolroom on Pennsylvania Avenue, near 11th Street, was the erection of a church building.[4] A few months later there came to the city Rev. Robert Little, who on account of his health had given up the pastorate of the Unitarian Church at Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, England, and determining to devote himself to mercantile pursuits had brought a stock of dry-goods, hardware, etc., from England and had opened a store on Pennsylvania Avenue.[1] It was not long before the English preacher became acquainted with those of like religious views, who were planning to build a church and who were holding meetings over the baths on C Street, just east of 6th, in a room that was 16×50 feet. By the summer of 1820[2] subscriptions for the proposed church building were being solicited, and by the following spring Mr. Little had become so identified with the enterprise that he was conducting the services, which were suspended while he travelled through the north soliciting funds.[3] That fall the First Unitarian Church was organized. Mr. Little became the pastor, and on June 9, 1822, the edifice of brick at the southeast corner of 6th and D streets, designed by Charles Bulfinch, with smooth plaster finish exterior, and simple in detail and form, was dedicated.[4] Here, five years later, Ralph Waldo Emerson, then but six months in the ministry, preached one Sunday, while on his way home from a trip to the south.

---

[1] Thereafter the president at times occupied the presidential pew at St. John's Church, but generally attended the First Presbyterian Church. Three years in North America. James Stuart, 1833, Vol. 2, p. 75.

[2] Historical Discourse in Commemoration of the 70th Anniversary of the Fourth Church. Washington, 1898.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 13, April 11 and 17, 1818.

[4] *City of Washington Gazette*, Jan. 5, and *Intelligencer*, Jan. 6, 1819.

While the workmen were still engaged on the structure, Jared Sparks, at that time pastor of the Unitarian Church in Baltimore, was elected chaplain of the house of representatives, which was looked upon by some as a recognition of a religious belief they regarded with evangelical abhorrence, and which Rev. Dr. Hawley, from the pulpit of St. John's Church, declared meant that the house had voted Christ out of doors.[5]

A series of discourses entitled Unitarianism, refuted by Rev. Anthony Kholman, superior of the Catholic Seminary in

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 23, 1819, and June 12, 1822. See also The Old and the New, a sermon by Moncure D. Conway. Washington, 1855.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 2 and Oct. 12, 1820.

[3] The same, May 19, 1821, and May 29, 1822.

[4] The same, June 12, 1822.

[5] Adams, Vol. 5, p. 458, Dec. 23, 1821.

Washington, were announced to be printed in monthly parts.[1] The congregation, a few months after the church was dedicated, rendered a public service by placing in the steeple of the church the first bell erected in the city, except the one at the capitol, used to announce the beginning and end of working hours.[2] Four years previous to this time, in order to correct, if possible, tardiness on the part of the members of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church at the southwest corner of South Capitol and B streets, arrangements were made for ringing the bell erected on the grounds of the capitol each Sunday at ten in the morning and at half-past three in the afternoon.[3] It was explained that "the difference in the watches and the want of them in many families" had "caused much irregularity in the attendance." A year after this device was adopted Rev. Reuben Post was called to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the first pastor, Rev. John Breckinridge, and by the following summer the frame church building was enlarged.[4] The building answered the purposes of the congregation for some seven years, when it was sold to an African Methodist Episcopal church, and a brick edifice with a pillared recessed entrance porch on a level with the street was erected on the west side of John Marshall Place between Louisiana Avenue and C Street northwest, a locality which was to become a favored residence section.[5]

The larger scope of the activities of the Presbyterian Church, as indicated by the changes noted, had further illustration in Georgetown, where the frame meeting-house, at the southeast corner of 30th and M streets, had been twice enlarged in the forty years since it was built, and then in 1821 was taken down. On this site was erected a spacious brick building of the same general plan as that of the structure of the Methodist Church on 28th Street, having the auditorium on the second floor, thus leaving the first or basement floor available for use as a chapel or Sunday-school room. It had the further distinction of having cost more to build than any other church edifice up to that period.[1] At that time the first pastor of the church, Rev. Stephen B. Balch, was in his seventy-fifth year, and was within twelve years of the close of a pastorate that continued fifty-two years and ended only with his life.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 1, 1821. To be printed by Henry Guegan, bookseller on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 14th and 15th streets.

[2] The same, Oct. 12, 1822. In less than two months the steeple on St. John's Church was also supplied with a bell. *Intelligencer*, Dec. 2, 1822.

[3] The same, June 26, 1818.

[4] The same, July 13, 1820.

[5] The same, Dec. 15, 1827. After a service of seventeen years Mr. Post was succeeded in the pastorate by Rev. W. McLain.

Three years before the new edifice of the Presbyterian Church was started, the congregation of Christ Episcopal Church, organized the previous fall, met for the first time in the new church home, at the southwest corner of 31st and O streets.[2] The first rector, Rev. Ruel Keith, came from St. John's Church, Georgetown, where he was an assistant to the rector, Rev. Walter Addison, who shortly afterwards gave up the rectorship of the church, but returned to it later on. While the new church prospered the older one declined, so that in the year 1831 services were no longer held in St. John's, and the building fell into neglect, and at one time was used as a workshop by a sculptor. It was finally sold for taxes, but in 1837 it was repurchased and restored to its original use.[3] The location of the new Episcopal Church, three squares north of M Street, the main artery of the town, furnishes no gauge of the movement of the population from the centre outward, as the earlier church of St. John's was planted fully as far north, but to the west and nearer to the other trade artery, that of 32d Street. On the other hand, the Presbyterian Church clung to its original location. When some of the members of the Methodist Church on 28th Street, two blocks to the east, joined what they termed the reform movement, that related entirely to the form of church government and resulted in the organization of the

---

[1] The estimated cost was $20,000. The congregation contained 80 families and the communicants numbered 109. Chronicles of Georgetown, pp. 150 and 161.

[2] Chronicles of Georgetown, p. 183.

[3] The same, p. 178.

Methodist Protestant Church, they built a brick church building on 31st Street between M and N streets. The little group, twenty-two men and seventeen women, organized in December, 1828, the Congress Street Methodist Protestant Church, the first church of the new denomination. The following spring a lot was purchased, where the church building was erected.[1] Among the members of the 28th Street church was Henry Foxall, who as a local preacher was active in church work. To Mr. Foxall and others, as representing the church, was deeded on June 3, 1814, a lot on the road that led down to the mill on Rock Creek, and is now known as 27th Street. On this site, a short distance north of P Street, was erected in that year, through the liberality of Mr. Foxall, a small building for the use of a society of colored Methodists, that was under the supervision and control of the white society as late as 1855. It became known as Mount Zion Methodist Episcopal Church.[2] Just to the north was the Methodist burial-ground, which had been in use since 1815.

Mr. Foxall, who had sold the Columbian Foundry in 1815 to John Mason, preparatory to a return to his native country, England, where he spent the remainder of his life, extended his benefactions to the denomination of which he was a member, by providing a church home for a Methodist society in Washington. It had been organized in 1814, but continued for three years as a branch of the Georgetown church. Mr. Foxall purchased ground at the northeast corner of 14th and G streets northwest, and erected there a brick building forty by fifty feet with an entrance from 14th Street. It was a memorial of the gratitude to God of its pious donor, that his gun foundry above Georgetown had not been destroyed by the British during the invasion of the city. For this reason it was given the name of Foundry Church, and also it commemorated Old Foundry in London, established by John Wesley. The church was dedicated Sept. 10, 1815, and remained in use for over thirty years, when it was remodelled and enlarged.[1] Fourteen years after Foundry Church was dedicated a number of its members organized Wesley Church, erecting an oblong building at the southwest corner of 5th and F streets northwest, which remained in use until replaced in 1856 by the present structure. But this branching off was merely one of the symptoms of growth in the community.

---

[1] Eighty-first Anniversary of Congress Street Methodist Protestant Church, Washington [1909].

[2] Centennial Sketch of Methodism in Georgetown, p. 37; Chronicles of Georgetown, p. 214.

At the time the Georgetown Methodists formed a Methodist Protestant Church there, some of the members of Foundry Church, who did not believe in having bishops, withdrew from Foundry. It was not until some three years later that this little band erected a building of frame on the west side of 12th Street between G and H streets northwest, which was dedicated in December, 1832. Three years later a more commodious building of brick was erected on the east side of 9th Street between E and F streets northwest.

At the same time the reformers were leaving Foundry, another little group, inspired by the same purpose, gave up their connection with the Fourth Street or Navy Yard Methodist Church. A schoolhouse at 6th and G streets southeast was purchased, and Mount Olive, or "the little schoolhouse church," was the home of this congregation for more than a decade.[2]

Hardly a twelvemonth passed after the completion of the second Episcopal church building in Georgetown when a movement was started in Washington to erect an Episcopal church in the section of the city between 2d and 14th streets,[3] but nothing came of it. Eight years later another attempt was made,[4] which resulted, in the year 1828, in the laying of the corner-stone of Trinity Episcopal Church on 5th Street between D and E streets northwest.[1] In the same locality a number of Baptists, principally from the First Baptist Church, then located at 19th and I streets northwest, were holding services, and the year that Trinity Church was being built a church was organized. For several years services were held in the city hall and then in a building on 9th Street. In the year 1835, after an existence of eight years, the church organization was dissolved and the members united with the First Church, which two years before had erected a more commodious edifice on the east side of 10th Street between E and F streets. Their first building was turned over to the colored members, who formed a separate organization known as the First Colored Baptist Church of Washington, and was the second church organization of colored people formed in the city.[2] Ten years before this provision for an enlarged work on the part of the First Baptist Church was made the Second or Navy Yard Church erected a brick edifice at the corner of Virginia Avenue and 4th Street southeast, and gave up the use of the frame structure near the corner of 4th and G streets southeast, which had been the church home for thirteen years. Farther to the west in the southern section of the city the Old School Baptists organized a church in 1827, and erected a meeting-house on Virginia Avenue near 4½ Street.

---

[1] Foundry Methodist Episcopal Church. Washington, 1904. *Intelligencer*, Sept. 8, 1815. Also Old Cannon Foundry. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 11, p. 42.

[2] Sketch of Methodist Protestant Church in the Maryland Portion of the District. *Evening Star*, Nov. 12, 1898, p. 20.

[3] *City of Washington Gazette*, Sept. 5 and 17, 1818.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 6, 1826.

Up to the year 1820 St. Patrick's Catholic Church was the only church of that denomination within the city limits, except possibly St. Mary's or Barry's Chapel on ½ Street southwest. It is probable that about this time the South Washington Church ceased to be used for church purposes. At any rate, in that year St. Peter's Catholic Church was built at the northwest corner of 2d and C streets southeast, on ground given by Daniel Carroll of Duddington.[3] In the same year St. Patrick's Church was being enlarged again under the direction of Rev. William Matthew, who had then served about a third of the half century that he was priest of the parish. It was not until 1838 that St. Patrick's ceased to be the only Catholic Church in the western part of the city. Then mainly through the efforts of Father Matthew, who helped on the good work, both by his efforts and his money, the corner-stone of St. Matthew's Church was laid on the site purchased at the northeast corner of 15th and H streets northwest.[1] Two years later the church building was dedicated.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 30, 1828. The site is now occupied by the Columbian office building. The church was opened for the first time April 11, 1829. *Intelligencer*, April 11, 1829.

[2] History of Baptist Institutions.

[3] Proposals invited for furnishing stone and brick signed by Daniel Carroll of Duddington, William Brent, James D. Barry and Ed. Mattingly. *Intelligencer*, July 20, 1820.

For some time prior to 1833 a German Lutheran congregation had been holding services in the city hall. In that year a church building was erected at the southwest corner of 20th and G streets northwest,[2] on a lot which had been donated in the early years by Jacob Funk and which had been secured for the use of the congregation after a decision by the United States Supreme Court. Two years after the Concordia Lutheran Church, to use the name of later years, was built, the ancient log church in Georgetown, erected by German Lutherans, which had fallen into decay through age and disuse, was replaced by a frame structure. Like the original building, its use for church purposes was irregular, owing to the small number of adherents. Four years after the Disciples of Christ or Christian Church had, in 1830, become a distinct denomination, a church was founded in this city. This was due to the labors of James T. Barclay, M.D., one of the active missionaries spreading abroad the teachings held by the followers of Alexander Campbell.[3] The first meeting was held in Dr. Barclay's residence near the navy yard.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 29, 1837, and Sept. 24, 1838. The city was divided into eight collection districts, so that a collector could call on every citizen for a subscription to the building fund. *Intelligencer*, July 18, 1838.

[2] The same, Aug. 1, 1833. A communication from the vestry of the United German Evangelical Church, signed by J. J. Lehmanowsky, C. Eckloff, A. Noerr, F. Stinger, George Krafft, Wm. Emmert, I. Indermaner and J. Ungerer.

[3] Historical Note in Register of the Membership of the Christian Church, Vermont Avenue and N Street. Washington, 1889.

The use of private homes was continued, and for many years the congregation did not outgrow such limited accommodation. When, seventeen years later, an appeal was made through the denominational newspaper for subscriptions to erect a church building in Washington, it was stated in regard to the local congregation, "a few disciples are there meeting in private rooms — a noble little band truly, but without much of this world's goods."[1] Four years before the civil war the congregation was using Temperance Hall.[2] But it was not until four years after the war that a church home was secured, when a frame structure on M Street near 9th Street, used as a mission station, was purchased from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, then in a new location at the northeast corner of 9th and K streets.

As a further illustration of the massing of the population of the city in the section which broadly may be said to lie between the capitol and the White House, it will be noted that of the thirteen church buildings erected in the city from 1816 to 1840 all but two were in that locality. The residential character of the White House locality had an early beginning, and continued until a comparatively modern period. Samuel Harrison Smith established his winter home on the west side of 15th near H Street, in the year 1828. At that time Mrs. Smith found most of her acquaintances lived within two squares of her house.[3] In that year Benjamin Ogle Tayloe, son of John Tayloe, began the erection of a residence on the east side of Lafayette Square[4] and was living there by the year 1830. Then Commodore John Rodgers, who as member of the board of navy commissioners had been a resident of the city since the war, but preferred the locality of Greenleaf's

---

[1] The Millennial Harbinger. Reprinted in the *Intelligencer*, Jan. 23, 1851.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 21, 1857. Also notice of a baptism in the Potomac, foot of 8th Street, "by the Campbellites or Disciples," when three were baptized.

[3] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 238. The site of 734 15th Street of to-day.

[4] Now known as 21 Madison Place.

Point as a place of residence,[1] was building a house directly to the south of the Tayloe house, where he lived.[2] The Rodgers house was hardly completed when, in the year 1831, Dr. James S. Gunnell erected a house at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Place. He was living there when he was selected by President Van Buren to be postmaster of the city. According to the gossipy chronicles of Mr. Tayloe, in making the appointment one condition was imposed on Dr. Gunnell, that he should appoint his brother-in-law, who was an active politician in Maryland, assistant postmaster. At any rate, B. F. Mackall took the place which had been held during the past eight years by Thomas Corcoran. The latter in the early forties began the erection of a house on the north side of Lafayette Park, just west of the Swan House, which he did not live to complete.[3] About the year 1824 Count de Menou, the secretary of the French legation, and for a time chargé d'affaires, built a three-story house with stuccoed front on the north side of H Street between 13th and 14th streets.[4] Here he lived, and also, up to 1839, three ministers from France: Roux de Rochelle, M. Seurier and Edouard Pontois.[5]

Somewhat farther away than the two squares mentioned by Mrs. Smith was the residence of William Wirt, on the south side of G Street between 17th and 18th streets. Mr. Wirt was then just bringing to a close a service of twelve years as attorney-general. His residence,[6] like that of the Cutts, the Tayloes, Rodgers, Gunnells, Ewells, Swanns and Decaturs, was of no special architectural merit, but it had large rooms, and made a comfortable home. Always from these houses there was the pleasant outlook on gardens. For ground was not only abundant but cheap, and the houses of the day were not cramped for building space.[1] The cultivated gardens and lawns about the houses in Washington were regarded as one of the distinctive features of the city. A correspondent of a Baltimore paper, in commenting upon "these rural accompaniments" of city home life, was impressed by the thought that they "must have some effect in producing and maintaining that purity, and elegance of taste and that high moral tone for which the resident population of Washington is distinguished. I do not believe," he adds, "there is a city in the Union where a more correct taste in literature and the arts, in manners, in all the habitudes of society generally prevails, in proportion to the number of inhabitants, than in Washington."[2] Besides the personal interest shown by the residents in lawns and gardens, Washington, soon after the second war with England, became the home of John Adlum, who cultivated grapes at his vineyard, now the site of the Bureau of Standards, Connecticut Avenue and Peirce Mill Road, with such success that he holds the first place among the horticulturists of this country. Then, too, there was Joshua Peirce, whose nursery for trees was on the west side of Rock Creek, near the Klingle Road.[3] Both of these men joined with such citizens as Colonel Nathan Towson, paymaster-general of the army, Joseph Gales, W. W. Seaton, R. S. Cox, Francis Loundes, George Watterston and others in forming the Columbian Horticultural Society.[4] Apparently there was no need for such a society, as it only lasted some three years. Naturally this popular taste for flowers and plants developed the business of the nurserymen, and by 1853 there were enough in the city to form an association for the purpose of giving weekly exhibits during the season.[1] Four years later the Washington Horticultural Society was organized and gave an exhibition.[2] Hotels did not begin to flourish in the White House section until after 1840. The old Washington Hotel on Pennsylvania Avenue near 15th Street did not figure prominently in the life of the city, and the same may be said of the Mansion House or City Hotel at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street. There were no hotels of consequence west of 15th Street after the Franklin House closed in 1827. There were, however, two banks within one square of each other and facing the treasury department. This circumstance indicates what was indeed a fact, that the business of at least one was more with federal fiscal affairs than with local finances. The Bank of Metropolis had not changed its original location on 15th Street, while the branch bank of the United States, in June, 1824, invaded its territory by removing from the building erected by the first bank of the United States, at the northeast corner of 13th and F streets, where it had been for six years, to the building which it had just completed at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 15th Street.[3] Here it continued in business for twelve years, when Jackson's veto put an end to its existence.[4] Samuel Harrison Smith, after serving for nearly a decade as president of the Bank of Washington, succeeding the first president, Daniel Carroll of Duddington, was placed at the head of the branch bank in 1828. At that time the business of the Bank of Columbia, next to the Bank of Alexandria the oldest bank in the District, was taken over.[5] The closing up of the business of the Columbia

---

[1] His house was on P Street between 4½ and 6th streets southwest.

[2] In Memoriam Benj. Ogle Tayloe, p. 176. Now the site of Belasco's Theatre. During Jackson's term Roger B. Taney, the secretary of the treasury, lived there. James K. Paulding, secretary of the navy in Van Buren's cabinet, occupied the house.

[3] Tayloe, p. 179. Now 1607 H Street.

[4] Now the site of 1321 H Street.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 21, 1839. Property offered for sale.

[6] Site now occupied by Y. M. C. A. building.

---

[1] An illustration of land values is found in a trustees' sale at this period of the whole of Square 223 bounded by 14th and 15th streets, G Street and New York Avenue, for which the Bank of the United States paid $1631.25.

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 31, 1839.

[3] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 10. Sketch of Nurseries in the D. C., by John A. Saul.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 29, 1833, and June 27, 1834. The florist of the day, John Douglass, whose place was at the northeast corner of 15th and G streets, was also a member.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 8 and Sept. 14, 1853; *The Star*, March 29, 1854.

[2] *The Star*, April 18, 1857. W. W. Corcoran, president; W. B. Magruder, 1st vice-president; Geo. W. Riggs, 2d vice-president; Darius Clagett, 3d vice-president; Wm. Cammack, treasurer; John Saul, corresponding secretary; Wm. Hughes, recording secretary. Also *Star*, May 20, 1858.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 18, 1823, and June 24, 1824.

[4] The same, March 8, 1836.

[5] 23d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 46., Dec. 29, 1834.

Bank left in Georgetown the Farmers and Mechanics Bank and the Union Bank, the resources of each being greater than any one of the three Washington banks.[1] The next decade, with its years of hard times and suspension of specie payment and flood of paper money, left its record on the banks of the District. In 1815 the number of banks reached its maximum, when there were eleven chartered and unchartered institutions. During the next ten years there was a decrease of two, as there were four in Alexandria, three in Washington and two in Georgetown. Fifteen years later, in 1840, there were but six banks in the District, divided as follows: two in Alexandria, three in Washington and one in Georgetown.[2] Five years after the Bank of Columbia had left the field to its two competitors, the first savings-bank in the District was established, when the Georgetown Savings Institution was organized.[3] Thirteen years later the first provision for savings accounts in Washington was made, when the Patriotic Bank, William A. Bradley, president, opened a savings department.

The new home of the branch bank was a substantial building, two stories in height. Following the custom of the day, the residence of the cashier was in an adjoining building, which like the banking house had an exterior finished with stucco and owed its excellent proportions to the good taste of the designer, George Hadfield. It was the most notable structure in the city, other than a public building.[4] As the *Intelligencer* recorded on June 11, 1838, the business centre of the city was Pennsylvania Avenue between John Marshall Place and 8th Street, although six months earlier that paper noted the opening of a dry-goods store by Darius Clagett in a building twenty-five by seventy-five feet, just erected at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 9th Street, "the largest and handsomest store on Pennsylvania Avenue."[1] In this section, also, were two of the four banks of the town. The Patriotic Bank, after the first ten years of its existence on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 9th and 10th streets, erected in the year 1825 a building at the corner of 7th and D streets. Three years later the Bank of Washington left the building erected for its use on New Jersey Avenue southeast, and occupied rented quarters on the first floor of the new National Hotel.[2]

---

[1] Ten Mile Square, p. 226. The resources of the institutions at that time (1829) were as follows: Bank of Washington $668,043, Bank of the Metropolis $649,248, Patriotic Bank $467,450, Farmers and Mechanics Bank $816,426, Union Bank $720,615.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 17, 1840. The surviving banks were the Bank of Alexandria and Farmers Bank of Alexandria, Bank of Washington, Bank of Metropolis and Patriotic Bank of Washington, and Farmers and Mechanics Bank of Georgetown.

[3] The same, Dec. 27, 1833. John Kurtz, afterwards president of the Farmers and Mechanics Bank, was the president, and W. S. Ringgold, the treasurer. Deposits of $1 and upwards were received. Three per cent interest was paid.

[4] The same, Aug. 24, 1836. Description of the property which with the adjoining ground had a frontage of about 200 feet on both streets. It remained in use as a banking house until it was torn down

When the Washington Theatre building, the only one in the city, and one that had served the purpose for some seventeen years, was destroyed by fire, in 1821, it is evident the convenience of the public was consulted, for the new building was put up on the south side of Louisiana Avenue, just east of 6th Street. It was in close proximity to the two leading hotels, while on the C Street side of the square were the baths and across the street a large building known as the Circus, where entertainments were given.[3] Whatever may have been thought of the site of the new theatre in 1821, eight years later a movement was started, which, however, ended in nothing, to have a theatre building in a more central part of the city, as it was explained, and one that would be more convenient to Georgetown.[4] The location in view was the

---

in 1904 to give place to modern buildings occupied by Riggs National Bank and the American Security and Trust Co.

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 3, 1837. This building replaced the dry-goods store of C. E. Washington and Co. destroyed by fire a few months previous. *Intelligencer*, May 29, 1837.

[2] In 1832 the bank removed to the building at Louisiana Avenue and C Street which it had purchased.

[3] *Intelligencer* Jan. 13, 1819. Early mention of the place. Site now known as 476 C Street, N. W.

[4] The same, Feb. 4, 1829. Early Washington Theatres. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 5, p. 80.

open public space on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 13th and 14th streets, where there had been a building called the Rotunda,[1] used for exhibitions of various sorts. The theatre was growing in importance as the city became larger, and the year 1829 witnessed winter engagements instead of a summer season of companies that spent their winters in Philadelphia.[2] The change in location, attempted in 1829, succeeded five years later, when the site of the present National Theatre, on the north side of E Street between 13th and 14th streets, was purchased, and a large theatre building erected.[3] Adopting the new style, the pit was filled with chairs, and those who had heretofore occupied that space in the Washington theatres were obliged either to pay the higher price or else go to the upper gallery.

The theatre-goers left the old theatre for the new, and the latter came into occasional use only. When, however, the circus visited the town, and there is no earlier record than 1830,[4] the tent was set up on the open space in front of the Centre Market.[5] The year before the corner-stone of the First Presbyterian Church was laid in 1827 the same ceremony was performed at the corner to the north, where four lodges of Masons had purchased ground at the southwest corner of Louisiana Avenue and John Marshall Place.[6] The change in the location of such a centre from 11th and C streets is a further indication of the expansion of the general locality.[7]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 9, 1831, and July 26, 1834.

[2] In the year 1831 the father of Joseph Jefferson became manager of the Louisiana Avenue Theatre, and the famous actor, whose home was in the rear part of the building, began his stage career there at the age of four.

[3] Theatre opened Dec. 7, 1835.

[4] *Intelligencer*, March 30, 1830. Grand circus of animals on 13th Street "near the centre market."

[5] The same, Oct. 29, 1834, also Sept. 12, 1839.

[6] The lodges were Federal, Columbia, Lebanon and New Jerusalem.

[7] The building had three stories, the upper floor being used by the lodges, while the rest was rented for various purposes. Owing to financial difficulties arising in part from the Antimasonic movement, the property passed from Masonic control in 1843. History of the Grand Lodge and of Free Masonry, p. 142.

In another centre of importance, the vicinity of the navy yard, the Masons occupied a two-story brick building at the northwest corner of 5th Street and Virginia Avenue, erected by Washington Naval Lodge.[1] When the fourth triennial session of the Baptist General Convention for Missions met in the First Baptist Church at 19th and I streets northwest, in the spring of 1823, it was decided to accept the offer of the use of the F Street Presbyterian Church "as more central."[2] As the first general gathering in the city of representatives of one of the leading religious denominations of the country, the occasion was a notable one. But Washington, to those interested in the progress of the Baptist church, meant more than a mere meeting-place; for it had become a centre of the church work, the home of its mission board, the seat of a college that was to include schools for all the learned professions, and the place of publication of the church paper. In the course of four years conditions changed. The office of the mission board was removed to Boston, as was also the publication office of the *Columbian Star*,[3] while the official connection between the general convention and the newly established Columbian College came to an end. At the same time the animating spirit of the entire scheme of enlarged mission and educational work, Luther Rice, entangled in the meshes of financial imprudences, was no longer the official agent of the board. He had gone into this enterprise with the fire and enthusiasm which had led him to join the group of four young men who, in the year 1810, by their appeal to the congregational churches of Massachusetts to be sent as missionaries to foreign lands, brought about the formation of the American Board, the first foreign missionary organization in this country. Two years later these five young men started for India, and on the voyage two of them, Luther Rice and Adoniram Judson, became convinced that the views of the Baptists as to baptism were scriptural. Upon their arrival they were immersed, and as this change of views separated them from the American Board, Judson began his career as missionary, which proved to be one of the most useful in the history of foreign missions. Rice returned to this country on the special errand of arousing the Baptist church to the needs of the foreign work.[1] A man of stalwart frame, and of indomitable energy and pervasive enthusiasm, he travelled about the country organizing missionary societies. A few months after he began his work a general association for missions of Baptist churches was formed, and he became the general agent. He was early impressed with the need of an educated ministry. In the fall of 1818 a theological school was established in Philadelphia, and two years later it was removed to Washington. Rice had been busily collecting subscriptions both in the city and throughout the country. In conjunction with several members of the denomination, including Rev. Obadiah B. Brown, the pastor of the First Baptist Church, he bought for $7000, forty-six and one-half acres of land on the brow of the hill overlooking the city, just to the west of 14th Street. By the fall of 1821 a large structure of brick and two houses for members of the faculty had been built on the property.[2] In the spring of that year the charter of Columbian College was procured from congress, and the first month of the next year the college was opened.[1] In addition to a collegiate department, there was also a theological and a medical department and a preparatory school, and the purpose was announced of organizing a law department.[1] On the 15th of December, 1824, the first commencement was held in the F Street Presbyterian Church, and was attended by the president of the United States, James Monroe, General Lafayette, General Jackson and other prominent men.

---

[1] History of the Grand Lodge and of Free Masonry, p. 142.

[2] *American Baptist Magazine*, Vol. 4, p. 137, July, 1823. From the files of this publication is derived much of the information about the establishment of Columbian College and other activities of the church in this city at that period.

[3] *Intelligencer*, July 6, 1827. In Philadelphia the name of the church paper was the *Latter Day Luminary*, but when the publishers, Robert Anderson and John S. Meehan, came to Washington and began the publication, Feb. 2, 1822, the name was changed to the *Columbian Star*. In 1825 Mr. Meehan withdrew from the paper and for a few months was publisher of and then writer on the Jackson organ, the *U. S. Telegraph*. He became secretary of the board of trustees of Columbian College, and May 29, 1829, was appointed librarian of congress by President Jackson. History of the Library of Congress, p. 213.

---

[1] American Pulpit. Baptist, p. 602, W. B. Sprague.

[2] The college building was four stories high, 117 feet long and 41 feet deep.

[3] Rev. William Staughton, the secretary of the general convention and head of the theological school since its organization, was

The fair prospect was soon overclouded, and dissensions within, and lack of support without, reached a crisis in 1826, when the general convention severed its relations with the college, the president and the entire faculty resigned, and it seemed as if, under the burden of debt, the hope of establishing an institution of learning at the national capital was gone. Financial assistance had been sought, not alone in this country, but in Europe; appeals had been made to congress, but that body granted no aid except six years later, when a number of city lots were donated to the college. For twenty years the college struggled along before it finally got rid of the indebtedness, which was in part, at least, attributed to the unwise financial management of Luther Rice. But the breadth of his vision was recognized even in the gloom of his failure as a financier, and so the college faculty was reorganized, the relations with the church body restored, and the valuable services of Luther Rice, as agent of the college, again employed.

The medical department from the outset found a place in the community, where no facilities of the sort existed, and was at once self-supporting. In the spring of 1825 the school was formally opened, and the course of lectures delivered in a

---

elected president. The associates of Mr. Staughton in the theological school, Rev. Ira Chase, Josiah Meigs, commissioner of the general land-office, Dr. Thomas Sewall, physician, and Dr. James M. Staughton, son of the president — were the members of the first faculty.

[1] This was accomplished in February, 1826, and Judge William Cranch and William T. Carroll were appointed professors, but the school had but a short existence. Brief Chronicles of the Columbian College. James C. Welling, Washington, 1889.

building rented for that purpose, on the west side of 10th Street just north of D Street northwest. But the building was so ill adapted for the purpose that the members of the faculty purchased a lot at the northeast corner of 10th and E streets northwest and in the structure erected there the third course of lectures was given in 1826.[1] With the exception of making use of the authority of the charter of the college in conferring degrees, the Medical School received no assistance from the trustees, and what was done was entirely at the risk and on the responsibility of the members of the faculty. At the same time the need for such a school is indicated by a memorial of citizens, sent to congress the same year, which was not granted, asking for a charter for a medical college.[2] With the resignation, in 1826, of Rev. Dr. Staughton as president of the college, the theological school of which he had been the head since it was founded, nearly a decade before, went out of existence. It had begun its career in the District shortly before the Virginia Theological Seminary had been opened near Alexandria in the year 1823. As an enterprise fostered by the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Virginia, the Alexandria institution had been established while the diocese of Maryland, to which the portion of the District north of the Potomac belonged, had under consideration the founding of a Protestant Episcopal Seminary in Washington.[3] The convention of 1822, which was held in St. John's Church, decided to establish a seminary in the Nation's capital, but at the convention held the following year, when a report of the trustees was made, it was found that such differences of opinion prevailed as "to the best mode of providing for the education of the ministry" that no further action was taken.[1] Columbian College remained under sectarian auspices, although provision was made in the charter for broadening the control, and there is evidence that a more varied representation of the Protestant community would have been welcomed. In fact, efforts were made to combat the general notion that the institution was merely sectarian, but without bringing about any permanent change, either in this conception or in a more general coöperation in the management. At one time it was thought the college might realize the hope of Washington, and become the National University. For the larger enterprise had not been lost sight of, as it had been called to the attention of congress by Presidents Madison and Monroe, and referred to by President Adams, in his first annual message, three years after the opening of Columbian College.

---

[1] The following were owners of the property as tenants in common: Drs. Thomas Sewall, James M. Staughton, Thomas Henderson, Nicholas Worthington Frederick May and Richard Randall. Liber W, B, f. 19. March 18, 1827.

[2] 19th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 35, Feb. 13, 1826. This memorial elicited a protest from the medical department of Columbian College against creating another medical school. The same, Sen. Doc. No. 36.

[3] Journal of the Convention for 1822, p. 35.

The comprehensive plan proposed by the founders of the public school system of the city, which contemplated the finishing off of the edifice of popular education with the capstone of a college course, was not revived in connection with Columbian College. As has been pointed out, the school system in its original form showed the influence of the idea of the city as a national centre and reflected the intelligence of the community that at such an early period in the nineteenth century favored tax-supported schools. Financial circumstances reduced the actual operation to maintaining two elementary schools for the entire city. At the end of fifteen years the school attendance was limited to the children of those unable to pay. In the course of two years after the schools were opened in 1805, the appropriations from the city treasury for their support, which amounted to fifteen per cent of the entire annual revenue, was cut in half. Although the bulk sum provided was increased as the years went on, yet the proportion to the annual receipts declined.[2] It is not difficult to understand why the representation of the contributors on the board of trustees was done away with by the ordinance of 1818, for since the first subscription to the schools, which supplied the money for the erection of the two schoolhouses, no financial help had come from that source. Then, two years later, the admission of pay pupils was forbidden, and it was directed that the schools "shall consist entirely of children whose parents are unable to pay for their tuition."[1] During the year preceding this change, Joseph Lancaster, the founder of the system of instruction in use in the schools, visited this country and was received with much enthusiasm in Washington, where he delivered two lectures on his system, in the hall of the house of representatives.

---

[1] Journal of the Convention for 1823, p. 17, May 30, 1823. Rev. Dr. Wilmer, the rector of Christ Church, Alexandria, was nominated for professor by the trustees in their report.

[2] In the year 1816 the annual school appropriation was $2000, which was between six and seven per cent of the revenue for that year.

Four years earlier the Georgetown corporation had taken over from the association of individuals the management of the Lancaster school in that town, and for twenty-seven years, or until 1842, and by an annual appropriation of $1000, provided for the education of the children of the poor.

The two Washington schools, one in the eastern and one in the western section, were looked upon by the citizens who were expected to use them as charity schools.

The motive for the change in the scope of the schools was undoubtedly financial. The income from the pay pupils was not sufficient to provide additional school buildings as the school population increased. Even when the long expected and much delayed lottery fund became available,[2] no change was made in the annual provision for the schools. For while the income of the six per cent endowment fund of $40,000[3] was more than the annual school expenses, the difference was not sufficient to add to the number of school buildings, and so each year a surplus was accumulated that was reinvested and

---

(*Intelligencer*, Aug. 31, 1816.) Ten years later the percentage fell to about four and in the next decade to two per cent.

[1] City Ordinance, Oct. 24, 1820.

[2] Between the date of the law authorizing a school lottery and that on which the fund was realized was a period of fifteen years.

[3] City Ordinance, July 27, 1826.

added to the fund.[1] In one sense the schools were benefited by the lottery enterprise, but, broadly speaking, they were injured, as the corporation was crippled by the necessity of borrowing $200,000 to pay the principal prize, and other obligations which had come on the city in consequence of the dishonesty of the agent of the lotteries.[2] For twenty years after 1826, when the endowment fund became available, the number of the schools remained the same as well as the system of conducting them. The Western School occupied leased buildings until the year 1821, when by permission of the president of the United States the use of the former White House stable, at the southeast corner of 14th and G streets northwest, was secured.[3] The Eastern School was also shifted about, and after the opening years when it was located on East Capitol Street, presumably between 1st and 2d streets, there is no clear trace up to 1822 of its whereabouts. For three years prior to 1814 "the corporation scholars" were taught with the pay scholars of John McLeod, an Irish school teacher, who had opened a school in the year 1808 on the west side of 8th Street, a short distance north of I Street southeast, and opposite the Marine Barracks.[4] He was the most individual figure of the early days of education in Washington. For thirty-eight years, or until his death in his eightieth year, he conducted a school that brought him money and also reputation, for it was said of him that he taught three generations of Washingtonians.[1] He had the impetuosity, the fire and the kindliness of the Celtic nature. His was a forceful personality. In a community where eight hours constituted the average school day throughout the year, he was able to prolong it by adding from an hour and a half to two hours, not alone in his school, but other schools, impelled by his success, followed his example. "My school is open and in complete order by daybreak throughout the year," he stated in a newspaper card,[2] "the teachers ready to attend the scholars, as they enter, and there is always a great number at business by sunrise." But his motives were assailed as well as the wisdom of such a change in the practice. "It is well ascertained by long experience," exclaims one of his critics,[3] "that a man cannot study more than three hours at one period, much less can boys or children. Why then is this practice of eight or ten hours introduced? Only to cajole and bias the favors of the public." Another competitor, however, declared he recognized "the salutary effects both moral and intellectual that flow from early rising," and announced he would pursue the same practice in his school.[4] One of these imitators went so far as to announce that his school would begin at sunrise, and that he gave "neither holiday nor vacation."[5] Another detail strenuously insisted upon by Mr. McLeod was a brief vacation period confined to two weeks in August, also the 4th of July, and New Year's day, and every other Saturday.[6] "The only motive," he asserted, "for these long and protracted vacations is the pleasure and convenience of the preceptor. We are gravely told that the instruction of youth is a laborious employment. There is not a syllable of truth in this assertion. It is not more laborious than the common occupations of life."[1] Two weeks in summer was the only vacation period except the recognized holidays that were provided for in the early scheme for the conduct of the public schools. But a tendency towards a more liberal provision in the private schools was manifest.[2] But the opposition to using Saturday as a school day came from within, as Mr. McLeod found. Some of the boys, he states, for he adds parenthetically "the female students are remarkable for their attendance at all times,"[3] are reluctant to attend on Saturdays because they are not accustomed to it. He urges the cooperation of the parents in this particular.

---

[1] History of the public schools in report of board of trustees for 1874–1875, p. 38. By the year 1840 the fund was $46,000.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 8, 1827. Abstract of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Chastain Clarke *vs.* the city corporation of Washington. Clarke was the winner of the principal prize of $100,000.

[3] During the year 1814–1815 the school was not held, as the building on E Street between 7th and 8th streets was occupied by the military guard. History of public schools in school report for 1874–1875, p. 22. The teacher, Henry Ould, finally secured a building on the south side of F Street between 9th and 10th streets northwest, where he kept the school until the removal to the Jefferson stable, as it was called. (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 2, 1821.) Mr. Ould continued in charge of the school until 1836, completing twenty-five years of service.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 1, 1841. Land records. Liber Z, f. 23, and A, F, f. 105. For a long period the school was located on D Street between 3d and 4th streets southeast. See City Directories from 1822 to 1850 inclusive.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 28, 1846. Notice of Mr. McLeod's death.

[2] The same, Aug. 19, 1820.

[3] The same, May 18, 1821. See also another attack in the *Intelligencer* of March 26, 1825.

[4] The same, March 4, 1828, Oct. 7, 1830, and Oct. 4, 1832.

[5] The same, Oct. 13, 1831. See also the long hours adopted by a Capitol Hill school-teacher. The same, Oct. 7, 1830.

[6] The same, March 2, 1822.

After the war with England, Mr. McLeod sold his school property near the navy yard and erected a school building with a residence adjoining at the southwest corner of 10th and G streets northwest.[4] A year later, the sessions of Central Academy, as the school in the new locality was named,[5] were begun. It was no doubt with a heart swelling with pride and satisfaction that after an experience of two years Mr. McLeod informed the public he had 145 scholars, and his school yielded an annual income of $3000.[6] Perhaps this rather candid statement of the financial side of his school was his method of counteracting the effect of an advertisement for a teacher for the Eastern Academy. The building was offered for rent to a well-qualified man with the explanation that the late principal, whose death had just occurred, had 90 scholars, and his annual net income exceeded $1700.[1] A characteristic announcement is to be found in a paragraph in one of the cards about McLeod's school that appeared with great regularity each year in the *Intelligencer.* For McLeod wanted mechanics to know he would take, in exchange for the tuition of their daughters, their labor, and especially that of carpenters. A few years before this time an application was made to congress by the Mechanics Relief Society of Alexandria for permission to hold a lottery to raise money for the society, which aimed among other things to provide a school for the children of mechanics.[2] For nearly twenty years Central Academy continued under Mr. McLeod's direction, when he sold the property to Rev. Father Matthews, founder of St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, for the use of that institution. At once a site was secured at the northwest corner of 9th Street and Grant Place northwest, where Mr. McLeod erected a school building which he named the Columbian Academy,[3] and where he continued for eleven years to open his school at sunrise until death called him in the midst of his active career.[4] During the building season, in 1816, immediately preceding the purchase of the 10th Street site by Mr. McLeod, a three-story brick building was erected on F Street, just east of St. Patrick's Church, which was described as a Catholic Seminary.[5] The following June a school was opened there by George E. Ironsides.[6] The school was known as the Washington Literary Institution, and was located in that building for two years.[7] From 1821 to 1827 the building was used as a Jesuit novitiate, and where also a school was conducted under the name of the Washington Catholic Seminary by Rev. Anthony Kohlman. As fees were received, contrary to the rule of the order, the school was closed by direction from headquarters. At that time, Rev. Jeremiah Keiley was the principal of the school, and not acquiescing in this decision, he gave public notice that the institution had been removed to Congress Hall, as he styled the Brick Capitol.[1] At the same time the public was informed in another column of the newspaper that the sessions of the seminary have been discontinued and that the students will be received in Georgetown College.[2] On the opposite side of F Street, in the year 1817, when Mr. Ironsides opened his school, was the Western Lancaster School. At that time an effort was made to raise money by subscription to erect a building on the Patent Office Square, where a school conducted on the Pestalozzian principle was to be opened.[3] The appeal did not meet with an adequate response, but a school of this kind was started by Rudolph Schaer of Berne, Switzerland, a pupil of Pestalozzi, in a house on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 9th and 10th streets.[4] After an experience of less than two years, the enterprise was abandoned.[5] A spacious building was erected in the year 1824, at 35th and P streets, where in the following spring a young ladies' seminary was opened under the direction of the Sisters of the Convent of Visitation.[6] A girls' school was founded in 1831 by Miss Lydia S. English, and for many years was located at the northeast corner of 30th and N streets.[7] Another school of repute, on the west side of Rock Creek, was Georgetown Academy, which continued, as it had begun, under the direction of able men. When David Wylie gave up the school, it was carried on by Rev. James Carnahan. After a service of nine years, Dr. Carnahan, in 1823, was elected president of Princeton College. He was followed by Rev. James McVean, who taught until his death nearly a quarter of a century later.[1]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 12, 1840.

[2] The same, March 26, 1825. A defence of a vacation period in schools extending through August and September. The writer evidently favored a still longer vacation period, as the statement is made that more is done in 40 weeks than in 52.

[3] The same, Nov. 1, 1836.

[4] Land records, Liber A, M, f. 394, Nov. 26, 1816. Lease of John P. Van Ness to John McLeod for ninety-nine years at an annual rental of $115 with the right to purchase at any time at the rate of ten cents per square foot. Lots 9, 10 and 11, Square 346. The ground extended along G Street 100 feet and on 10th Street 138 feet.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 25, 1817.

[6] The same, April 8, 1819.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 2, 1819.

[2] Annals of Congress, 14th Cong., 1st Sess., Jan. 22, 1816, p. 730. An adverse report was made in the house on this petition, based on hostility to lotteries as a species of gambling, which represents the change that had taken place in public opinion on this subject.

[3] *Intelligencer*, May 16, 1835.

[4] The same, Dec. 28, 1846. Notice of his death.

[5] The same, Aug. 31, 1816.

[6] The same, June 24, 1817; "in the new seminary adjoining St. Patrick's Church." Mr. Ironsides gives as his references the president and professors of Georgetown College and Rev. Mr. Matthews.

[7] The same, June 9, 1819.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 25, 1827.

[2] The building was leased for twenty succeeding years and used as a private school. In 1848 the Jesuits opened a school, reviving the name of Washington Seminary. (*Intelligencer*, Sept. 15, 22 and 25, 1848.) Ten years later a charter was obtained from congress incorporating the institution under the name of Gonzaga College. Sketch of Gonzaga College. Washington, 1897.

[3] *Intelligencer*, July 16, 1817.

[4] The same, Dec. 16, 1817, and April 14, 1818.

[5] The same, Feb. 6, 1822.

[6] The same, March 2, 1825.

[7] The same, March 2, 1835, and Aug. 10, 1838.

---

[1] Early Days of Washington, p. 198, by S. Somervell Mackall.

CHAPTER IX

THE JACKSON RÉGIME

The aggressive spirit of the victors in the election of Andrew Jackson in the fall of 1828 appears in local affairs in Washington just as clearly as in the wider field of national politics. Then for the first time in the history of the city a local campaign committee was formed. After the campaign closed, the Jackson central committee not only continued its organization, but also in large part its activity.[1] Duff Green, a member of the committee, and also the proprietor of the Jackson organ, the *Telegraph,* as well as the committee itself, represented the widespread conviction that the election of General Jackson meant that only members of the party were to be intrusted with the direction of public affairs. As far as possible the central committee at once put this doctrine into practical operation and gave a partisan character to public occasions, but at times with the explanatory statement that the committee was authorized by the friends of General Jackson.[2] It was the committee that arranged for the celebration of the anniversary of the battle of New Orleans by a dinner at the National Hotel, and it was the committee that planned for a demonstration in Jackson's honor upon his arrival in the city on the 11th of February and then again it was the committee that took charge of the arrangements for the inaugural parade and ball. At the same time, while a partisan committee was doing what had heretofore been done, ostensibly at least, by representatives of the community, the *Telegraph* was relentlessly preaching the doctrine of proscription for political opinions in a community of many office-holders, largely adherents of a party that had been defeated. The *Intelligencer* and *Journal*, the anti-Jackson papers, entered a protest against such utterances, but only to elicit from the *Telegraph* the belligerent warning of unrelenting war against any one who should "dare to step between the party and proscription." [1] When it was urged that faithful public servants, whose living and that of their families depended on their places, ought not to be removed for merely political reasons, the *Telegraph* coldly retorted that "no one should be continued in office who, in a country like this, cannot make an honest living" when deprived of a government office. Day after day a clean sweep of the offices was advocated, and even before Jackson arrived, a large proportion of a community that had for more than a quarter of a century witnessed one administration succeed the other without alarm for their personal interests was in a state of uncertainty and apprehension that steadily grew to a panic of nervous fear. As described by Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith, the government employés were "tremblingly alive to what may happen." [2] As the days went on, the anxiety became intense. In some cases minds gave way, and several committed suicide.[3] For this reason the situation in Washington during the greater part of 1829 was perhaps the unhappiest that has been experienced by the city as a whole before or since.[4] Besides the mental suffering and anxiety, as was pointed out by one of the large property holders, the value of real estate was unfavorably affected.[5] Yet as an examination of the records indicates, the disturbed state of the public mind was due more to the fear of what might happen than what did actually happen.[1] As it turned out, the sweeping proscription, favored by the *Telegraph*, and forming the war-cry of a large number of the party followers of Jackson, was not applied to the government service in Washington. Still many lost their places. In some instances they had become identified with the life of the community, so that the changes were more than merely a matter of personal or family interest. In addition, the central committee's plans, in their entirety, did not prove to be the plans of General Jackson. His reception in Washington was in much the same fashion as that in other towns where the elaborate plans had been toned down on account of the death of Mrs. Jackson some six weeks before he started on his journey. As he drove into Washington in the carriage of Senator John H. Eaton of Tennessee, who had gone to Rockville to meet him, he was received at Pennsylvania Avenue and 20th Street by the members of the central committee on horseback, and then escorted to the National Hotel.[2] A few hours later a salute fired on the Mall announced that the official count of the electoral vote had been finished and General Jackson formally declared the choice of the country.[3] The period of nearly three weeks prior to the inauguration spent by General Jackson in the city has not continued to be the custom. In other respects the surroundings and the arrangements of that event form the foundation and the beginning of many of the usages that have prevailed ever since. General Jackson's purpose to receive the public generally each day from twelve to three, after an experience of three or four days, was abandoned.[4] This was due to the great throng of people, and in this circumstance, as well as in the crowded condition of the hotels, where visitors slept in bar-rooms, and in all other available places, is found the modern note of a great temporary throng of people. Then for the first time on such an occasion the inaugural committee drew up a plan for the parade,[1] and also made another innovation in issuing an order regulating the approach of carriages at the inaugural ball.[2] As planned by the central committee, the president elect was to be escorted to the capitol, as had been the custom, by military companies,[3] but General Jackson, as he was in mourning and desirous of avoiding all display, decided to walk to the capitol, following in this particular the example of Jefferson on the occasion of his first inauguration. The committee had a week's notice of this presidential plan, and it resulted in nipping in the bud, as it were, the formation of the Jackson Riflemen, a military corps that was being organized for the occasion.[4] The central committee appointed Colonel Nathan Towson, the paymaster-general of the army, and a member of the committee, marshal of the day, thus ignoring the marshal of the District, who on former occasions had acted in that general capacity. However, this assumption of authority on the part of the committee, which was made the more conspicuous by the innovation of issuing an order of parade and regulations for the ball, no doubt stirred into active protest the discontent of those not disposed to submit to its management.[5] As the result presumably of representations made to General Jackson, the marshal, Tench Ringgold, was given a place at the side of General Jackson as he walked to the capitol, while the committee's marshal supported him on the other side. The snow and rain that had fallen a few days prior to the 4th of March had partially disappeared from the unpaved surface of the avenue under the warm beams of a sun that rose on a balmy, springlike day.[6] His head bared, the white locks making him conspicuous in the mass of people that surrounded him, the president elect left the National Hotel

---

[1] The chairman was John P. Van Ness and the secretary H. C. Neale. Philip Stewart, Theodore Sim, Henry Ashton, H. M. Morfitt, William Jones, Duff Green and Thomas Corcoran were members. *U. S. Telegraph,* Jan. 3, 1829.

[2] *Telegraph,* Jan. 3, 1829.

---

[1] *National Journal*, Jan. 12, 1829.

[2] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 273.

[3] McMaster, Vol. V, p. 531.

[4] "An intense gloom hung over the city in the spring of 1829." William Winston Seaton, p. 210.

[5] Civil Service and the Patronage, p. 131, Carl R. Fish. The Calvert referred to in the quoted letter from Van Buren as finding the party policy bad for real estate was George Calvert, who was the owner of the National Hotel and also at that time president of the Bank of Washington.

---

[1] Civil Service and the Patronage, p. 127.

[2] *Telegraph*, Feb. 4, 1829.

[3] The same, Feb. 12, 1829.

[4] The same, Feb. 12 and 16, 1829.

---

[1] *Telegraph*, March 4, 1829.

[2] The same, March 3, 1829.

[3] The same, Feb. 24, 1829.

[4] The same, Feb. 10 and March 2, 1829. In the published notice to the corps of this change, the commanding officer stated General Jackson wished to avoid military display as inconsistent with republican principles.

[5] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 8, p. 101.

[6] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 290.

and began his progress towards the capitol. The central committee led the way, then came a few survivors of the Revolution,[1] and then officers who were present at the battle of New Orleans. Following the president elect and his escort as they walked along the sidewalk on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue came the people in such order as they chose, while the roadway was filled with crowded vehicles of all kinds. The inaugural parade was really in two sections, but marching abreast, the foot passengers on the sidewalk and the vehicles in the roadway.

Owing to the reminders left of Jefferson's four rows of poplars, the full sweep of the avenue was not available. East of John Marshall Place the brick sidewalk dwindled to half its width, while those who had sought freer movement on the south side found, when they came east of 3d Street, there was no sidewalk in front of the neglected public grounds that lay to the south, and which continued east of 1st Street, and up to the circular walk that followed the tall iron fence about the capitol grounds. Another modern note is heard in the description given of the crowd, so great that the president elect and his attendants were unable to make their way round to the north entrance as had been planned. Instead they passed into the grounds through the west gateway,[2] and along the gravel walk that led to the first flight of steps on the face of the grass-covered slope of the terrace.[3] In the hurry of the moment but little regard was paid by the crowd to the adornment of the grounds, which had already begun to attract attention,[1] although the improvements were only in part carried out. However, trees and shrubbery and flowers and stretches of lawn adorned the enclosure, which was under the care of the gardener, John Foy, the first incumbent,[2] and a comparatively recent addition to the civil service list.[3] As the main entrance from the terrace was crowded, the president elect climbed over the area wall and entered the building by the sub-basement. Although for the first time on such an occasion police arrangements had been made, yet "the police and other police officers of Washington and Georgetown" summoned by the marshal of the District through a newspaper notice [4] to aid him in maintaining order, were apparently stationed within the building.

---

[1] The names of twelve of these veterans are given, among them being Jacob Gideon, William Gamble, Phillip Stewart and John M. Taylor. (*Telegraph*, March 4, 1829.) Mr. Gideon died in his 87th year. (Notice of his death, *Intelligencer*, March 3, 1841.) His son, Jacob Gideon, Jr., was at the head of one of the large printing-offices of the day.

[2] As the gates of this principal approach were always kept open, congress was urged by the architect of the capitol to appropriate money for a fence on each side of the walk "for the purpose of keeping the grounds from the intrusion of cattle." 20th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 69, Feb. 4, 1829.

[3] The building of the terrace and the steps was the last work done by the architect of the capitol, Charles Bulfinch. The building being completed, the office was abolished and Mr. Bulfinch's services ceased in June, 1829.

After proceeding to the senate chamber, where John C. Calhoun took the oath as vice-president, the usage was established of the president elect going to the east front, where on the portico in the presence of the people, who crowded the steps and the eastern enclosure of the grounds, the inaugural speech was delivered and the oath administered. President Jackson then left the building by the west entrance, and walking through the grounds mounted a horse at the gate and rode up the avenue to the White House, attended as before by the people en masse.

So great was the throng that the interior of the White House soon became choked up, and the president was forced by the pressure of the crowd against the wall, and found safety in leaving by the south entrance and returning to his hotel. In the meantime the furniture was broken, the glass and china for the refreshments were trampled under foot. Finally relief from what was a situation of peril to life and limb was found by using windows as doors and also by serving the punch in the grounds. As Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith, who had been identified with the old régime, observed, "ladies and gentlemen only had been expected at this levee, not the people en masse." [1] Another marked change in the usages of inauguration day was made. The retiring president, Mr. Adams, held no reception, nor indeed did he occupy the place that had been provided for him at the capitol. For more than two weeks General Jackson had been in the city, and yet he had not called on the president. The bitterness of the campaign was still in his heart. His animosity towards Mr. Adams was specially deep, because he believed he countenanced the circulation of the story directed against the good name of his wife. So he remained at one end of the avenue and the president at the other.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 30, 1829.

[2] The same, July 24 and 25, 1833. Notice of his death and sketch of his life. He was succeeded by James Maher, also a native of Ireland.

[3] *National Journal*, March 4, 1829. Statement by Mr. Foy of what he hoped to accomplish in making a collection of trees and plants representing every part of the country.

[4] *Telegraph*, March 3, 1829.

The resolute man in the White House gave no sign. He leased the home of Commodore Porter on Meridian Hill, and there, a day or so before March 4th, went Mrs. Adams. On the evening of the 3d the president left the White House and walked out to his new home. Familiar with the custom of the day, he caused notices to be published requesting that the usual call on the retiring president be omitted, "owing to the distance from the capitol of his residence." [2] President Jackson did not attend the inaugural ball in the evening, owing to his being in mourning, but the spectacle at Carusi's, where it was held, was described as brilliant.[3] As might be expected from the uncertain prospects of a large proportion of the population of Washington in the spring of 1829, real estate values were not only depressed, but general business suffered. Added to these troubles affecting so largely the community, the winter was one of unusual severity, bringing with it destitution and suffering to many. Following the usual course in such an emergency, committees were organized, in this instance appointed by the mayor, in each ward to solicit contributions of money, fuel and clothing for distribution to the needy.[1] For the first time federal aid was given, the house directing that fifty cords of wood be donated,[2] while no doubt the members, following the example of the president, added their individual contribution to the general fund. The executive departments had no available fund to draw from for such a purpose, but as a pressing need was fuel, the treasury and the war departments sold at cost from their supplies of wood still largely used to keep going the open fires that were the only means of heating the buildings, and in that way the citizen committees were able to get fire-wood at much less than the current market rate.[3] This form of poor relief was in use in other cities of the day as well as in Washington. Not that other devices were untried. Nearly a decade before some kind-hearted citizens opened a soup house on Capitol Hill.[4] Two years later, what was looked upon as a wiser plan was attempted in the organization of the Howard Society, designed not alone to ameliorate the condition of the poor, by giving immediate relief, but to prevent pauperism, vice and crime. This was to be accomplished mainly by providing work, encouraging the practice of economy and aiding the corporation to carry out the laws for the punishment of disorderly persons and for the binding out of children found begging on the streets.[5] Buildings were provided on the Eastern Market Square and also on Centre Market Square, where women were employed in making garments and in spinning, knitting and in picking oakum.[1] In the course of four years the society, by charging a small profit on the clothes sold, made this part of the work self-supporting.[2] Then it was able to go on for thirteen years when, owing to lack of support, its doors were closed.[3] A decade after the Howard Society was formed, Peter W. Gallaudet, one of its active supporters, who held a position in one of the departments, organized, in connection with other citizens, the Washington Manual Labor School and Male Orphan Asylum,[4] where agriculture and horticulture and the trades were to be taught, and in addition a good English education was to be given. The means to carry out such an admirable plan were to be obtained largely from the sale of a facsimile copy of General Washington's accounts during the revolutionary war.[5] While the book was issued and several editions were printed and the society was incorporated in 1842, yet the school was never opened. By a singular coincidence, the fund of $4000, held by the trustees, was, in 1860, turned over to the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, at the head of which was Dr. Edward M. Gallaudet, a grandson of the originator and promoter of this early plan for a trade school.[6] As the experience of the winter of 1829 demonstrated, the need for temporary relief was not done away with by the efforts of the Howard Society. The widening of the scope of charitable effort was shown by the opening of another orphan asylum, in October, 1825, in a community where the Washington City Orphan Asylum had been carrying on its work for a decade. The new institution was the Female Free School and Orphan Asylum, established in a house on F Street, under the direction of the Sisters of Charity,[1] and by the invitation of Rev. William Matthews, the pastor of St. Patrick's Church, who three years later purchased property at the southwest corner of 10th and G streets northwest, where the home was established. When a charter was granted in 1831 by congress, under the name of St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, the property was vested in a board of trustees.

---

[1] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 296.

[2] *Intelligencer*, March 3, 1829; Adams Memoirs, Vol. 8, pp. 104 and 105.

[3] The price of the tickets was $5. *Telegraph*, Feb. 24, 1829.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 23, 1829; also First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 284.

[2] Six years later the house made similar provision to relieve the suffering of the poor. *Congressional Globe*, p. 929, Jan. 6, 1835.

[3] About the year 1830 coal grates replaced in the treasury building the open hearths, as being safer. Anthracite coal, that was just beginning to be brought to the city from Philadelphia (*Intelligencer*, June 11, 1831), as well as Richmond coal, was used. 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House, Doc. No. 22, Dec. 12, 1834, p. 22.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 31, 1822.

[5] The same, Jan. 14, 1825. Constitution of the society. Samuel L. Southard, the secretary of the navy, was made president and was followed by W. W. Seaton, who was the vice-president, as was George Blagden. John Coyle, Jr., was the secretary and W. A. Bradley, treasurer.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 16, 1824.

[2] The same, Nov. 24, 1828.

[3] The same, Nov. 18, 1842, and May 3, 1842. The Union Benevolent and Employment Society was organized seven years later with a similar purpose. The same, Dec. 24, 1849.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 20, 1835.

[5] 24th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 120, Feb. 23, 1836.

[6] History of the Columbia Institution. Edward M. Gallaudet. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 15.

A female orphan asylum had also been established in Georgetown, and in the year 1828 it was incorporated by congress, as was also the Washington City Orphan Asylum.[2] Four years later, Alexandria had its Orphan Asylum and Female Free School supported by contributions from the citizens.[3] Congress aided the Washington institutions by granting to each, in 1832, public lots of the assessed value of $10,000. But the aid proved illusory. In the course of fifteen years the trustees of the Washington City Orphan Asylum had been able to dispose of only two of the twenty-nine lots, and as they despaired of even getting the appraised value, they offered them for sale at less.[4] The two institutions became so land-poor that the city council came to their relief by remitting all the accrued taxes and exempting their property from taxation for two years.[5] Although the needs of the institutions in the other two towns were called to the attention of congress, yet nothing was done. Even President Jackson had only the near-by orphanages in mind when he decided to dispose of a troublesome present. He directed to be sold at public sale the Numidian lion given him by the King of Morocco, and the proceeds, $3350, were divided equally between the two Washington asylums.[1] Almost as embarrassing were the kind intentions of admirers in New York state, who wanted General Jackson to be equally honored with Thomas Jefferson. By the contributions of the entire country-side a cheese was made weighing 1400 pounds, which arrived in Washington early in 1837, the closing days of Jackson's term. It was served at a public reception at the White House on the afternoon of Feb. 22, the visitors helping themselves to hunks of cheese carved out from the mass. Two years later a large piece weighing 700 pounds was advertised to be sold at a local grocery store by direction of General Jackson's successor, Mr. Van Buren, for the benefit of the Female Union Benevolent Society,[2] an organization formed by the ladies of the city, who proposed to help the poor only "after careful observation and inquiry as to the needs" had been made by the managers.[3] Just as Georgetown was, for the first time, providing a poorhouse for the town, aided by a bequest of John Barnes, the collector of the port for twenty years, who left $3000 for that purpose,[4] it was found that the requirement of a residence of several months in the city as a condition of admission to the Washington poorhouse was depriving, even of this last resort, a growing class of the needy. To meet this emergency, the Irish schoolmaster, John McLeod, organized the Washington Relief Society, became its president and opened a house on F Street, where destitute strangers could find a refuge.[5] But the cry of the poor still arose, and the spectacle of their misery and suffering shocked and distressed the kindly and humane. Each year the well-to-do were called upon to contribute to the funds of various organizations, and when the winter was long and severe, a public subscription was made. In the winter of 1828 a fair was held for the benefit of the Washington City Orphan Asylum, and as a result, aided by the other resources, the managers were able to erect a brick building on the south side of H Street between 9th and 10th streets, on the site of a frame building which was the second home of the orphans.[1] The proceeds of the fair were increased by the sale of a Washington society novel, "What is Gentility," the manuscript of which had been donated to the managers of the fair by the author, Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith.[2] It was not the first work of fiction the scenes of which were laid in Washington. For six years before, in 1822, the "L—— Family in Washington," from the pen of George Watterston, the librarian of congress, had appeared. The form adopted was that of a series of letters. Two years later Mrs. Smith's first novel, "A Winter in Washington or Memoirs of the Seymour Family," came from a printing-office in New York. Then in 1827 Mr. Watterston's most popular novel was printed, "The Wanderer in Washington," which achieved a second edition in 1829.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 31, 1825; also Memorial of St. Patrick's Church, p. 17.

[2] The managers of the Georgetown institution, T. M. Cassin, first directress, Lydia H. English, second directress, Louisa R. Brooke, treasurer, and Maria W. Davis, secretary, appealed to congress for aid, as the funds of the institution derived from the contributions of the citizens of Georgetown were inadequate to provide for all the orphans. 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 31, Dec. 11, 1832.

[3] 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 65, Jan. 25, 1833. First annual report.

[4] *Intelligencer*, June 21, 1847.

[5] The same, Oct. 18, 1847.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 11, 1835.

[2] The same, Feb. 22, 1837; also Jan. 8, 1839.

[3] The same, *Intelligencer*, Dec. 17, 1838. The directresses were Mrs. James Laurie, Mrs. O. B. Brown, Mrs. Wm. G. Elliot, Mrs. M. St. C. Clark; secretary, Mrs. J. F. Webb; treasurer, Mrs. Joseph Ingle.

[4] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 7, p. 39. Sketch of John Barnes. The corner-stone of the poorhouse was laid in 1831 on land fronting on Wisconsin Avenue, in later years occupied by the Industrial Home School.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 22, 1831.

Already thoughtful men and women, not alone in Washington, but in other towns of the country, had begun to study the causes of poverty. As a result the conclusion was reached by many that much of the destitution was due to the drink habit. As early as 1817 Judge Thurston, in a charge to the grand jury, called attention to the evils of intemperance, and said the licensing of the traffic was an anomaly in legislation.[3] While this was an advanced view for that day, no doubt it was accounted for at the time as due to the mental peculiarities of the judge. For

---

[1] The first asylum was on 10th Street near Pennsylvania Avenue, but at the close of the first year a small frame building was erected on a lot given by Mrs. John P. Van Ness on H Street between 9th and 10th streets. In 1822 a larger building was secured on 7th Street between H and I streets, where the institution remained until the H Street house was built.

[2] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 210. *Intelligencer*, Feb. 15, 1828. Advertisement of the book by Pishey Thompson, the publisher. Also the same, Oct. 15, 1828.

[3] The same, Dec. 30, 1817.

John Quincy Adams, ten years afterwards, noted in his diary, upon the occasion of the judge calling at the White House, that he "is partially insane but knows and avows it."[1] Six years after this address to the grand jury Nathan Lufborough, the chairman of the committee of the levy court having the care of the poor of Washington County, including Georgetown, in an official report declared the laws granting liquor licenses lead to crime, poverty and begging.[2]

The report estimated the number of liquor-selling places in Washington, Georgetown and the county as 256, an average of about one to every 90 inhabitants. In 1912, in the same area, the proportion was one licensed liquor place to every 512 inhabitants. It was expected by those interested in the organization of temperance societies throughout the country, a movement of such proportions that in 1826 a national body was formed, that much could be accomplished by legislation. The effort was directed to the abolition of license laws. At that period, and for some years later, total abstinence was not a condition of membership of temperance societies. A distinction was made between distilled and fermented drinks. As stated in the constitution of the Franklin Temperance Society of Washington, having a membership chiefly of printers, while the members agreed not to use ardent or distilled spirits, "except in cases of bodily hurt or sickness," yet it was understood that "the moderate use of malt liquor, wine and cider is not prohibited."[3] The Temperance Society of Washington, Judge William Cranch, president, organized in 1828, had preceded in organization the printers' society.[4] The course of public sentiment is no doubt reflected in the change made, two years after the Franklin Temperance Society was formed, in the license system, then as old as the city, and which made the payment of a license fee the only requirement. The new ordinance required, on the application for a tavern license, the signatures of six property holders residing in the neighborhood of the premises for which application was made.[1] The temperance movement made such progress that a Temperance Union of the District was formed, composed of representatives of eleven societies in a territory where four years before there was only one.[2] An active non-license campaign was begun by the Temperance Union, and soon an array of statistics was presented. Of the 953 inmates of the poorhouses, jail and penitentiary in the District during the year 1835, the public was informed, all but 87 were intemperate.[3] With such a showing, a canvass of the city was made to obtain signatures to a memorial asking the city council not to grant licenses for the sale of ardent or distilled spirits,[4] while the following year the Union advocated using all proper means to bring about the repeal of the license laws in the three towns. At the same time the Union came out strongly in favor of the publication each year of a list of all tavern licenses, together with the names of the property holders signing the applications and in the course of a few years this form of restraint upon the traffic had the sanction of law.[5] Three years after the organized temperance movement began in Washington, and when state societies had been organized in twenty-one of the twenty-four states, the American Congressional Temperance Society was formed at a meeting in the hall of the house.[6] At that time the issue of liquor as a part of the ration of the soldier in the American army had been abolished by the action of Lewis Cass, the secretary of war, who was made the first president of the society. The same custom in the navy was gradually lessening. The one hundred members of congress and officers of the government who signed the constitution of the society pledged themselves "by example and moral influence to discountenance the use of ardent spirits and its traffic." The society had been in existence four years when the Temperance Union of the District, which by that time had on its rolls two societies that had come out for total abstinence, adopted resolutions deploring the sale of intoxicating liquors in the capitol building.[1] In the course of a few months, when congress convened, the senate adopted a resolution, adding to its standing rules a provision that no spirituous liquors shall be offered for sale or exhibited in the capitol or in the grounds.[2] Although seven years passed before the house gave its consent, yet evidently the restriction was in force on the senate side. Its effectiveness is described by Captain Marryat, the English novelist, who observed that at the restaurant when one "asks for pale sherry, they hand you gin, brown sherry and it is brandy, madeira, whiskey." [3]

---

[1] Memoirs, Vol. 8, p. 31, June 10, 1828.

[2] *Intelligencer*, July 22, 1823.

[3] The same, July 28, 1830. Reuben Johnson was the president, A. Rothwell, vice-president, S. A. Elliot, secretary.

[4] The same, Nov. 13, 1830.

---

[1] Ordinance, Nov. 5, 1832.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 11, 1834. In the issue of July 4, 1835, the officers of the Union are stated to be Walter Lowrie, the secretary of the senate, president; Judge William Cranch, vice-president; John Coyle, secretary.

[3] *Intelligencer*, April 11, 1836.

[4] The same, July 1, 1836.

[5] The same, July 7, 1837. The ordinance of Nov. 5, 1839, required the mayor to publish a list of the taverns, the names of persons to whom licenses had been granted and the names of persons recommending them.

[6] Proceedings and speeches at a meeting for the promotion of the cause of temperance. Washington, 1833.

During the spring and summer of Jackson's first year the feverish condition of the office-holders in Washington was kept at a high temperature as removals were announced from day to day. The painful question of Who next? was uppermost in every mind, while sympathy and interest were stirred for the fate of those who went out. Thomas Munroe, the city postmaster, had not long to wait, as the appointment of his successor was announced in less than two months. The new appointee, Dr. William Jones, a practising physician and a member of the Jackson central committee, did not, however, enter upon his duties until July 1.[4] Tench Ringgold, the United States marshal of the District, retained his place nearly two years [5] and then gave way to Henry Ashton, a member of the bar, and also of the Jackson central committee. At the end of three years Mr. Ashton died,[1] and he was succeeded by Alexander Hunter of Virginia. John S. Meehan, one of the writers employed on the *Telegraph,* received the position of librarian of congress, held from the creation of that office by George Watterston, also a newspaper writer and a contributor to the columns of the *National Journal,* the anti-administration organ. Some ten days after he lost his place Watterston became a member of the *Journal* staff, and the following year bought the interest of Peter Force, the editor, in the paper.[2] In the course of a few months Mr. Watterston disposed of his interest to Thomas L. Thurston, a son of Judge Thurston of the circuit court, who had lost his place as librarian of the department of state. At that time Phillip R. Fendall, another department of state employé up to the advent of General Jackson, was the editor of the paper.[3] In less than two years, the *Journal,* after advocating the election of Clay in the campaign of 1831, came to an end.[4] Then the *Globe,* which had started modestly as a semi-weekly in January, 1831, a few days after Jackson began his second term, became a daily, so that there were still three dailies in Washington.[5] Under the vigorous direction of Francis P. Blair of Frankfort, Ky., a farmer and banker and occasional contributor to the *Frankfort Argus,* who had come to Washington at the request of the president to establish a paper in his interests,[6] the new daily became a power. At the time of the appearance of the *Globe,* Duff Green, the editor of the

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 7, 1837.

[2] Register of Debates, p. 50, Sept. 18, 1837.

[3] A Diary in America, Vol. 1, p. 8, February 1838.

[4] History of the City Post-office. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 6, p. 170. Dr. Jones appointed his brother-in-law, Thomas Corcoran, also a member of the central committee, assistant postmaster.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 14, 1831.

---

[1] *Intelligencer,* March 1, 1834.

[2] History of Library of Congress, p. 189; also *Intelligencer,* Feb. 4, 1830.

[3] *Intelligencer,* June 16, 1830. Mr. Fendall was born in Alexandria, Va., in 1794, graduated from Princeton College and in 1820 was admitted to the bar in Alexandria, removing to Washington a few years later, where he was distinguished as a lawyer. Centennial History of Washington, p. 748.

[4] *Intelligencer,* July 9, 1832. At that time Wm. Prentiss was the publisher and John Agg, the editor.

[5] The same, March 7, 1831. The dailies were the *Intelligencer, Telegraph* and *Globe.*

[6] History of Journalism, p. 235.

Telegraph, was again elected printer of congress, but two years later Gales and Seaton got back the coveted job. The displacement of Duff Green as congressional printer in 1833, as well as the substitution of the *Globe* for the *Telegraph* as administration organ, marks the progress of the contest between the Calhoun and the Jackson adherents. Blair and the *Globe* became a strong influence in the administration. About the close of the first year of the *Globe* as a daily, John C. Rives of Virginia, who had held a clerkship in the treasury department for three years, resigned his position, and became a clerk and manager in the business office of the *Globe.*[1] It was not long before the partnership of Blair and Rives was formed, and while Blair was the editor and Rives the business manager, yet the latter had facility with his pen, and, like Blair, was forceful and picturesque in the use of the English language. The personality of the men as well as the power of political influence were factors in their securing a dominance in the publishing business in Washington. In a little more than a year after they began the issue of their paper, they entered the field which for eight years had been exclusively occupied by Gales and Seaton, in reporting and publishing in book form the proceedings of congress. Five years later, the older publication, the Register of Debates, abandoned the contest and ceased to appear. The *Congressional Globe,* as the Blair and Rives publication was named, began its career, in December, 1832. The prosperity enjoyed by the firm may be gauged somewhat by its ability, after an existence of five years, to purchase the property occupied as a printing-office, an achievement that no daily paper except the *Intelligencer* and the *Union,* for a time prior to the civil war period, was able to realize.[2]

---

[1] History of Journalism, p. 251.

[2] This was a row of three buildings on the north side of E Street or Pennsylvania Avenue between 13th and 14th streets, now the site of the Munsey Building. An interesting combination of names appears in the deed (W. B. 57, folio 352, July 14, 1836), as General John H. Eaton joined with the Bank of Metropolis in transferring the title from his father-in-law, William O'Neale, to the owners of the Jackson newspaper organ.

The same year the firm acquired its own home, Mr. Blair purchased for his residence the large house, 1651 Pennsylvania Avenue, from the estate of Joseph Lovell, surgeon-general of the army.

As long as the Democrats had the control of either house during this period Blair and Rives did the public printing, but when the Whigs had a majority, then Gales and Seaton were elected printers. In addition, the *Globe* was the mouthpiece of the administration, a relation which it sustained during the second term of Jackson, and through the administration of Van Buren, less than half of the long service in the same capacity of the *Intelligencer*. Both papers were organs of their respective parties. Such a function was exercised with more vigor and positiveness by the *Globe* than by the *Intelligencer*. The former did not hesitate to insist upon party discipline, and to attempt to suppress insubordination by vigorous assaults, a method described by Mr. Blair as shooting the deserters. Another victim of political changes in office, Benjamin Homans, sought to supply the place of his salary by publishing a paper, and so he bought the Georgetown paper, the *Columbian*, which he called the *Columbian Gazette*, and published it three times a week. "It cannot be expected," was his perfectly natural announcement, "that it will support the administration which has deprived the subscriber of his office without any cause. The editor, however, will express his opinion in a candid respectful way."[1] After three years' experience with the Georgetown newspaper, Mr. Homans decided to try the Washington field, and so he bought a weekly that had originally appeared as the *Washington City Chronicle and Literary Repository*, but then bore the name of *American Spectator and Washington City Chronicle*.[2] At once he restored the original name. For nearly a year he published both papers and then sold the Georgetown journal.[3] A few months later the Washington paper was suspended for lack of patronage.[1] Mr. Homans also retired from the partnership which he had formed two years earlier with Pishey Thompson, who had a book-store on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 11th and 12th streets as early as 1822.[2] As Mr. Homans gave up the book and stationery business in 1833, Franck Taylor bought out a similar business of Coale and Co. on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between John Marshall Place and 6th Street, of which he had been manager, and which soon became a noted literary resort.[3] Five years later, in the block to the east, William M. Morrison's book-store was established. The course of the publications of Mr. Homans illustrates fairly well the uncertainties in the business of publishing newspapers in the District. The successor of Mr. Homans as proprietor of the Georgetown paper, the *Columbian Gazette*, after a year's experience, sold it to William A. Rind, who, in a few months, stopped the paper,[4] and began in Washington the publication, twice a week, of the *Appeal*, devoted to the interests of Hugh L. White of Tennessee as a candidate for the presidency.[5] Although two years of Jackson's term remained, yet he had already named Van Buren as his successor. The *Appeal* represented what proved to be a minority revolt in the Democratic party against what was regarded as ring dictation. The *Appeal* made a record because of its few issues, as in the course of a couple of weeks it was absorbed by the *Sun*,[6] a semi-weekly also established in the interest of White, by J. D. Learned and Charles Pinckney. The latter had just acquired the *North American*, which had reappeared in the fall of 1834, having been suspended for some time.[1] Then they bought the *Appeal,* and dropping that name, as well as that of the *North American,* a semi-weekly was issued, called the *Sun.*[2] More completely than had been the case on any former occasion, all the candidates in the campaign of 1836 had their newspaper organ in Washington. In addition to the *Globe,* a daily supporting Van Buren, the *Intelligencer,* a daily advocating the election of the Whig candidate, Daniel Webster, the *Telegraph,* a daily savagely opposing Van Buren, the *Sun,* a semi-weekly setting forth the merits of Senator White, the situation was further enlivened by the appearance of the *Washington Mirror,* a weekly in the interest of William Henry Harrison, also a Whig candidate. It was published by William Dawes,[3] who had bought it from William Thompson, by whom it had been published for a year as a weekly.[4] In a few months after the campaign closed the *Intelligencer* and the *Globe* were the only survivors in this list of newspapers. The *Telegraph* was the last to go, as a few days before the inauguration of Van Buren it gave way to a weekly edited by Richard K. Cralle, who had, for little over a year, relieved Duff Green from the duties of the editorial department of the *Telegraph.*[5] The new paper, the *Reformer,* was one of Duff Green's enterprises. In the course of a couple of months it was removed to Baltimore, where it was published until the fall of 1837 under the name of the *Merchant.* Green had succeeded in maintaining a daily paper during the latter half of Jackson's second term without the public printing. Evidently it was a hard struggle. He attempted to make his printing-office a central plant from which newspapers could be issued at less expense than from individual establishments. His refusal to adhere to the scale of wages fixed by the Columbia Typographical Society, and his employment of "rats" and boys who had not served the usual term, brought him into collision with the organized printers, and one result was the first labor conflict in the District. The contest was more over the question of apprentices than that of wages, and the feeling ran so high that the two parties had street encounters, which led to arrests.[1] What especially stirred the organization of printers was the so-called institute or manual training school, which Green proposed to establish, because the students were expected to work eight hours each day in his printing-office.[2] This was branded as a device on the part of Green to get cheap labor, and as also in direct opposition to the rules of the society, which required a five years' service from apprentices, and no one bound as an apprentice older than fifteen. The society believed the coöperation of printers in other cities would be helpful, and as a result of correspondence, a meeting of delegates from various societies was held in the city hall in November, 1836, when the National Typographic Society was organized.[3] The national body adopted the rules of the local society in regard to apprentices, but they were not enforced by the societies,[4] and after holding a convention in 1837 in New York City, the national organization went out of existence. Prior to 1830, and for some years later, the societies of printers were more beneficial organizations than trade bodies, and the same was true of other trade associations. An early instance is the Washington Benevolent Society of Carpenters, formed in 1825.[5] The opening years of the decade, beginning in 1830, were a period of organization among the trades of Washington,[6]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 20, 1829.

[2] The same, May 22, 1832; also Nov. 30, 1830. James C. Dunn, publisher.

[3] The same, April 3, 1833. Joshua N. Rind of Georgetown was the purchaser.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 1, 1833. Some years later the name was revived in the *Washington Chronicle*, a tri-weekly. Library of congress file, Jan. 25, 1838–Jan. 3, 1839.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 7, 1822, Feb. 24, 1831, and Dec. 4, 1833.

[3] The same, Jan. 12, 1833.

[4] For a few weeks Georgetown was without a newspaper, and then a semi-weekly, subsequently a tri-weekly, was started, reviving the name of the *Metropolitan*. In a little more than a year the paper changed hands and also name, becoming the *Potomac Advocate*. *Intelligencer*, July 18, 1837.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 21, 1835.

[6] The same, April 20, 1835.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 4, 1834, and Jan. 22, 1835.

[2] The same, Feb. 23 and April 20, 1835.

[3] The same, Oct. 29, 1835, and Aug. 11, 1836.

[4] The same, July 24 and Oct. 31, 1834.

[5] *Telegraph*, Feb. 21, 1837. The last issue.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 8, 1835.

[2] Reply of the Columbia Typographical Society. Washington, 1834.

[3] Proceedings of the National Typographic Convention, Washington, 1836. Societies from New York City, Harrisburg, Baltimore, New Orleans and Washington were represented. The delegates from the latter place were John Stockwell, James Clephane and W. W. Curran.

[4] The Printers. George E. Barnett. American Economic Association, 3d Series, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1909.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 31, 1826.

[6] The references in the *Intelligencer* to these early trade organizations are as follows: Painters, April 9, 1830; Carpenters, June 16 and 22, 1831; Cabinet-makers, Nov. 10, 1831; Stone-cutters, Aug. 4, 1834; Cordwainers, Aug. 22, 1834; Tailors, Oct. 27, 1834; Saddlers and Harness Makers, Nov. 26, 1835; Masons, July 1, 1839.

so that by the year 1833 delegates representing six trades of the District met at the city hall and formed the Columbian Trades-union, adopting, with but few changes, the constitution of a similar organization then recently formed in New York.[1] It may be concluded that it was not long before the organization had a newspaper organ, as that is apparently the reason for the issue of the *American Mechanic*, the first newspaper of the sort published in the District.[2] Two years later another labor paper appeared. This was the *Washingtonian*, established by A. F. Cunningham, and issued first as a daily and then as a weekly. A two-page quarter sheet selling for two cents, it began in the spring of 1836, and probably did not survive the year. It is probable the trades-union ended its career about the same time.

As stated in the preamble to the constitution, the purpose of the trades-union was to secure "the right of fixing the prices of their own labor." The hours of labor were apparently regarded as of secondary importance, although in 1834, and for some years later, the rising and the setting of the sun marked the limits of a working day.[3] The Journeymen Painters Association, however, when organized in 1830, came out strongly for a ten-hour day, and five years later the trades-union of the District, encouraged no doubt by the establishment of the ten-hour day in New York, in 1834, announced the shorter day as one of the objects of the organization.[4] By direction of President Van Buren, whose term began in 1837, the shorter day was adopted in all government work and with no reduction in wages.[5] It is apparent that the range of the shorter-hour system was restricted, as nine years later the city council by resolution requested the president to have the ten-hour day in force in the navy yard extended to all government day work in the city. Prior to 1850, it may be concluded, the shorter workday had been adopted in private work.[1] When the consent of employers to an advance in wages was given, then their names were printed in the newspapers, with a notice signed by labor representatives, urging the public to patronize them, while for those in the business not mentioned, the inference was plain and was no doubt in practice an early form of the boycott.

---

[1] Oration delivered before the general trades-union of the District by A. F. Cunningham. Washington, 1834. Appended is the constitution and list of officers.

[2] As far as known no file of the paper has been preserved. In the city directory of 1834 John J. Hamilton is mentioned as the editor.

[3] Oration delivered before the general trades-union.

[4] Address in pamphlet form of the working men of the District, published by the trades-union of the District. Reprinted in Documentary History of American Industrial Society, Vol. 5.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 28, 1842.

Hardly six months passed after Duff Green had practically closed his career as the publisher of a political paper in Washington, when the *Madisonian* appeared, a semi-weekly edited by Thomas Allen, as the representative of the conservative element in the Democratic party. At first it supported the administration of Van Buren, but not the financial policy, as advocated by the Jackson wing of the party, and as represented by the *Globe*. In addition, the paper was printed in the office of the *Intelligencer*, and that fact, as well as its policy, aroused the ire of the *Globe*. The enemies of the *Globe*, combining with the Whigs, succeeded in bringing about the election by the house of the editor of the *Madisonian*, as printer, a position held by the *Globe* proprietors. It was not long before the *Madisonian* withdrew its support of Van Buren, and in the campaign of 1840 advocated the election of Harrison, and when he was elected, the paper came out as a daily. But Henry Clay was also a candidate for the nomination of the Whig party, and to advance his campaign the publication of the *National Whig*, a weekly, was begun.[2]

For four years, from 1837 to 1841, the *Intelligencer* and the *Globe* occupied the daily field. Many papers of less frequent issue were published. The most individualistic was *Paul Pry*, a weekly which was started in 1831, by Anne Royall, who by that time had to her credit eleven badly printed and badly written volumes descriptive of what she had seen and the people she had met during five years spent in travelling about the country. She had turned to writing, not that she had a gift that way, but she was a woman then fifty-seven years of age, left by the death of her husband entirely dependent on her own resources.

---

[1] The current practice began the day an hour after sunrise and ended it at sunset, with an hour for dinner, which made for the year an average workday of ten hours. *The Star*, Nov. 25 and 30, 1863.

[2] Charles C. Fulton and John L. Smith were the editors and proprietors. Library of congress file, Vol. 1, No. 3, May 12, 1838.

When she printed a book, she sold it by peddling it about. She had strong convictions which she expressed freely, and just as freely she gave vent to her prejudices, which were quite as strong. One of these was directed against the evangelical churches. She feared the church would control the state, and so she set herself against much of the religious movement of the day that found expression in churches, Sunday schools, and in advocating temperance, antislavery, and Sabbath observance. One result of the enmity and suspicion her course aroused was a charge brought against her in the circuit court of the District of being a common scold.[1] It was supposed that the penalty of ducking imposed by the old Maryland common law, inherited from England, was still in force in the District, but Judge Cranch in an elaborate opinion held that while ducking as a punishment was obsolete, yet the offence of which the jury had found the prisoner guilty, as charged, was punishable and imposed a fine of $10 and the defendant to give security for her good behavior for one year.[2] *Paul Pry* was not, as the name suggests, a purveyor of idle or malicious gossip, but represented the personality of the editress with all her foibles, the strength and the weakness of a woman who for a quarter of a century was one of the characters of the Nation's capital. At the close of five years the name *Paul Pry* was dropped and the *Huntress* was substituted.[3]

---

[1] Life and Times of Anne Royall, p. 133. Sarah H. Porter. The interest aroused in Mrs. Royall by this sympathetic account of her career found expression in the erection of a monument over her grave in Congressional Cemetry in May, 1911.

[2] Cranch C. C. Reports, Vol. 3, pp. 618–620, May term, 1829.

[3] The inclusive dates of both papers as given by Miss Porter are *Paul Pry*, Dec. 3, 1831–Nov. 19, 1836, *The Huntress*, Dec. 2, 1836–July 2, 1854.

When the Native American movement started, with the object of repealing the naturalization laws and keeping foreigners out of office, an association was formed in Washington that in the course of a few months had a membership of nine hundred.[1] The organ of the association was the *Native American*, a weekly,[2] which apparently did not survive long the destruction of its office by fire some three years later.[3] Up to the year 1840 the change in the method of getting before the public the news of what congress was doing, and what was transpiring at the political centre, was a gradual one. To a large extent the newspapers of the country still depended on the Washington papers, although what were known as letter-writers were in the habit of spending the congressional sessions in Washington and mailing to their papers such accounts of public men and public affairs as it seemed to them would be of interest to their readers. The representatives of the District newspapers, some six or seven in number, occupied seats on the floor of the house, and apparently the letter-writers were also provided with places there.[1] But in the senate in the year 1835 the reporters who had been sent to the gallery were brought back again to their old places on the floor. As only the representatives of District newspapers were allowed the privilege of the floor, six letter-writers, whom it may be presumed constituted the entire corps of correspondents at that time, sent a memorial to the senate, asking that either the same privilege be accorded them or that they be assigned seats in the gallery.[2] The senate declined at that time to make any further provision for newspaper men, but subsequently the reporters were again transferred to the gallery. The presentation of the memorial gave an opportunity for one of the senators, who remarked naïvely that, as he was retiring from public life, he could afford freely to speak his mind. In his opinion reporters were "miserable slanderers hanging on to the skirts of literature, earning a miserable subsistence from their vile and dirty misrepresentation of the proceedings here, and many of them writing for both sides." While there was reason to complain of highly colored reports, yet another speaker concluded that it was one of the evils of a free press. On the other hand, the consoling reflection was indulged in by another senator that newspaper abuse did not inflict any great degree of injury upon public men. In fact, he thought the newspapers had been of more benefit than harm.

---

[1] McMaster, Vol. 6, p. 428, July, 1837.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 2, 1837. Henry J. Brent, editor, and J. Elliot, Jr., printer. Library of congress file, Aug. 10, 1837–Nov. 28, 1840.

[3] The following list of periodicals other than those mentioned above is prepared from announcements of their appearance in the *Intelligencer* from 1830 to 1840.

American Statesman and Mechanics and Manufacturers Advocate. William Greer, publisher. (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 30, 1830.)

Banner of the Constitution. Raquets, editor. "Transferred some months ago from New York to Washington has been transferred from Washington to Philadelphia." (May 14, 1831.)

Military and Naval Magazine of United States. Monthly, Thompson and Homans. (May 1, 1833.)

Army and Navy Chronicle. Weekly, Thompson and Homans, absorbing the monthly. (Dec. 12, 1835.) "Only paper in the country exclusively devoted to that subject." (Oct. 30, 1839.)

Catholic Sentinel. (Oct. 12, 1833.)

Champagne Club. A serio-comic, literary and fashionable weekly. (Dec. 8, 1834.)

Niles's Register. Removed from Baltimore, three issues printed in Washington, September, 1837–April, 1839, and publication in Baltimore resumed.

United States Magazine and Democratic Review. Monthly, Langtree and O'Sullivan. (Sept. 14, 1837, and April 30, 1840.)

The Christian Statesman. Weekly, Rev. R. R. Gurley, editor. Devoted to literature, liberty, politics, African colonization and religion. (Dec. 20 and Feb. 2, 1837.)

The Weekly Visitor. Devoted to the interests of the Washington Lyceum. (Nov. 18, 1839.)

---

[1] *Congressional Globe*, p. 100, Jan. 5, 1839. No change was made in this arrangement until the house occupied the new hall, Dec. 16, 1857, when the gallery back of the speaker's chair was assigned for the use of the representatives of the press, the official reporters being given places on the floor.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, p. 61, Dec. 22, 1838. Those signing the memorial were William Hunt, James F. Otis, Erastus Brooks, William Elevyn Moore, E. Kingman and Wm. H. Whitman, representing the *Baltimore American, New York Express, Ohio Statesman, Georgia Journal, Southern Patriot, Charleston Courier, Mobile Register* and *Lancaster Intelligencer.*

In striking contrast to the balmy weather that marked the first inauguration of Andrew Jackson was the wintry condition of March 4, 1833, when he went to the capitol to take the oath of office for the second term. The snow which had fallen five days before still lay on the ground. A temperature of eleven degrees above zero following several days of extreme cold[1] put an end to whatever plans had been formed for a public demonstration. In addition the state of health of the president was so feeble that immediately upon his return from the capitol he went to bed,[2] and the usual reception was not held. Two inaugural balls were given. One at Carusi's and the other, the Republican Citizen's Inaugural ball, at Masonic Hall.[3] The wintry air also caused a change in the inaugural arrangements, so that the address was delivered and the oath administered in the hall of the house of representatives. For the first time the city as a corporation figured in the arrangements for the inaugural at the capitol. At the east front, according to the official program, the president elect was received by the mayor of the city and the members of the council, and conducted to the senate chamber, where the vice-president took the oath of office.[4] To the mayor of the city and the marshal of the District was intrusted the execution of the order of arrangements. The mayor was John P. Van Ness,[5] who was prominent in 1828 as chairman of the Jackson central committee. This organization was not maintained after Jackson's first inauguration. A Central Hickory Club was organized in 1832, but there was no identity between the two, and the new organization was not continued after the campaign.[6] Probably by the action of this club, John P. Van Ness, John H. Brent and Henry M. Morfit were elected delegates from Washington to the first convention of the Democratic party. It was held in Baltimore in 1832, when Van Buren was nominated for vice-president on the ticket with Jackson, who was the party's candidate by general consent. The Washington delegates, as well as two from Alexandria, constituting the District delegation, were allowed to vote, a privilege not again accorded District delegates to such gatherings until 1884. As the president, attended by the heads of departments and the marshal and his aides, hurried along the snow-covered avenue, the change that had taken place in that thoroughfare was of minor consequence. For the previous fall the avenue had been macadamized, the middle row of trees removed and the comfort and convenience of those using it increased by substituting for the depressions at street crossings underground drains to carry off the surface water.[1] At that time the most extensive improvement at federal expense ever undertaken, other than a public building, was only partially completed, as the following year the central macadamized section of only forty-five feet was extended to eighty feet, leaving fourteen feet on each side between the roadway and the curb to be covered with gravel. In place of the poplars along the sidewalks, English elms were planted. As they died, or were destroyed by accident, they were replaced by lindens, horse-chestnuts, maples, ash tree of Heaven, English sycamore and other varieties.[2] The avenue improvement extended up 15th Street, and along the front of the White House, and then down 17th Street, in front of the war and navy departments, thus emphasizing the statement of the house District committee in recommending the appropriation, that it was not merely for the convenience of citizens, but for the benefit of members of congress, officers of the government and others having business with the government.[3] A further indication of the federal purpose of the work was the exclusion of the sections of the avenue east of the capitol and west of 17th Street. Four years later the appearance of the latter suggested a resemblance more to "a corn-field than the great thoroughfare and principal avenue of a metropolis."[1] In spite of the condition of the avenue, crossed by open gutters and deep in mud or dust, a stage line was established, in the spring of 1830, between Georgetown and the city, with a morning and evening stage between the navy yard and Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th Street.[2] For the first time since the early abandonment of the initial attempt, thirty years before, the citizens were independent of hacks for travel between those points, and the rate of 12½ cents cut the minimum hack rates in half. As was suggested, the conveyances were given the new name of Omnibus, as they were "for the use of all men."

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 6, 1833.

[2] *Telegraph*, March 5, 1833.

[3] *The Globe*, March 4, 1833.

[4] The same, March 4, 1833.

[5] *Intelligencer*, June 18, 1832.

[6] The same, Feb. 21, 1840.

---

[1] 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. XI, Dec. 13, 1832; 23d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 24, Dec. 30, 1833.

[2] *Washington Mirror*, Dec. 6, 1834.

[3] 21st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 184, Feb. 10, 1830. The cost of the pavement, which was a new method of street improvement, was $2.98 per cubic yard for a covering of broken stone nine inches in depth.

As the carriages drove up to the White House with the presidential party, March 4, 1833, they passed beneath a covered portico, which was built during the first months of Jackson's first term, thus completing, after it had been occupied for nearly thirty years, the exterior of the Executive Mansion.[3]

At that time the furnishing of the east room was completed, so that then it became generally available for the social uses of the day.[4] It was not until a year of Jackson's second term had passed that water was introduced into the house,[5] and then provision was not only made for the kitchen and pantry, but hot and cold shower-baths and water-closets were provided. The old frame stable at the end of the east wing was removed, and a hundred yards to the east a stable was built with accommodations for ten horses.[6] The White House water-supply came from springs in the square, bounded by 13th, 14th, I and K streets northwest, which had been purchased after a long delay, owing to the unwillingness of the government to pay what was regarded as a high price, when, in 1819, an appropriation was made for that purpose.[1] Thirteen years later the sum of $6900 was paid for the 174,417 square feet, which is at the rate of about four cents per square foot. From this source came the water that supplied not alone the White House, but the executive departments in its vicinity. At the same time, to furnish fire protection for the capitol, as well as drinking water for the members, an acre of ground containing several springs was purchased from John A. Smith, whose residence, Effingham, was located a short distance north of Florida Avenue and west of 1st Street northwest.[2] As this water was piped down North Capitol Street, it flowed into reservoirs in the east and west grounds of the capitol, and was introduced into the building, so that by 1833 the members of congress were no longer dependent on pumps in the yards. In addition, the water was used to keep green the lawns and supply the flower beds and shrubbery that then adorned the immediate locality of the building. The Tripoli monument, a year before Jackson's first term expired, had been brought from the navy yard and placed on the terrace at the western entrance, while in place of the gravel walk leading to the main gate at the west flagging had been put down.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 31, 1837.

[2] The same, March 10 and April 12, 1830.

[3] The work was done under the direction of James Hoban, the designer of the building, and it was probably his last professional engagement, as he died two years later, aged 73 years. *Intelligencer*, Dec. 9, 1831.

[4] Historical Sketches of the Ten Mile Square, p. 161. Jonathan Elliot, Washington, 1830.

[5] 23d Cong., 2d Sess., Ex. Doc. No. 35, Dec. 23, 1834.

[6] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 18, 1834.

During the summer of 1832, a large number of laborers, principally Irish and German, came to the city, and for the most part recent emigrants were engaged in macadamizing Pennsylvania Avenue, working on the canal and digging the trenches for the water-pipes.[3] There was no place for them except miserable hovels. In the middle of August an epidemic of Asiatic cholera broke out. The city was entirely without hospital facilities, except the infirmary of the poorhouse at 7th and M streets, and which was designed for the aged and infirm, but had for years been the only place that was available for such a use.[1] There was of course the Naval Hospital, which had been opened as early as 1808 near the Marine Barracks,[2] and was then occupying the building, erected by the government some fourteen years later, on the west portion of the square fronting on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue, between 9th and 10th streets southeast, and still in use for that purpose. But it was not available for general hospital uses.

---

[1] 22d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 291, Feb. 15, 1832.

[2] The spring site is now a part of the Howard Reservoir.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 8, 1833. First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 335.

The board of health at once took active steps to check the progress of the disease by issuing regulations restricting the sale of fruit, certain vegetables and also prohibiting the sale of liquor. All theatrical and other public entertainments were forbidden.[3] Three hospitals were opened in houses leased for the purpose and supplied with a staff of doctors, the cost being met by the city and individual subscriptions.[4] In the course of a month the scourge had disappeared, after having taken toll, not alone in Washington, but in Georgetown and Alexandria.[5] The full tide of work, at least on the avenue, was not resumed until November, but the lesson of the visitation, as a writer in the *Intelligencer* pointed out, was the need of establishing a hospital in Washington.[6] The site suggested was the public square between 7th, 9th, F and G streets. It was proposed not only to use public ground, but also that congress should provide the building. A committee of the board of health sent a memorial to congress on the subject, and the effort was continued almost yearly for more than a decade before such a feature of community life was secured. It was not alone the straitened financial resources of the city that justified such an appeal. Rather it was the necessity thrust upon the city, of caring for the strangers who were drawn there because it was the Nation's capital. In one year that apparently was not exceptional seventy-five per cent of the inmates of the infirmary were non-residents.[1] Not alone was there no public provision for the care of the sick, but for the insane who developed violent symptoms the common jail was the only place provided. Even after an attempt was made in 1835, by an insane man, to shoot President Jackson, while on the east portico, on his way out of the Capitol, six years passed before any change was made in the provision for the safe-keeping of this class. As it happened, the disordered mind of Richard Lawrence, a painter by trade and a resident of Georgetown, seized upon this method of redressing fancied wrongs,[2] but, as the *Intelligencer* observed, "it is a notorious fact that this city, being the seat of government, is liable to be visited by more than its proportion of insane persons, strangers who imagine that congress is omnipotent, and for the accomplishment of any wild scheme a visit to Washington (sometimes performed on foot) is all that is necessary."[3] But when the jury found a verdict of not guilty in the case of Lawrence, because he was insane, the only way to dispose of the case, as he was unfit to be at liberty, was to commit him to the common jail. At that time there were six insane persons in the Washington jail.[4] It was proposed to congress that a hospital be erected in the city for the care of such persons, in connection with a general hospital,[5] but nothing was done until 1841, when an appropriation was made for the temporary care in the Baltimore asylum of lunatics in the District jail.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 2 and 6, 1820. Attempts had been made by the brothers, Dr. Thomas Ewell and Dr. James Ewell (*Intelligencer*, Feb. 19, 1821), but had been unavailing, to open a city hospital.

[2] *Intelligencer*, April 15, 1808.

[3] The same, Aug. 17 and 20, 1832.

[4] The Western Hospital was in a double brick house on the south side of M Street between 18th and 19th streets; the Central Hospital in a house on the west side of 10th just north of Pennsylvania Avenue, and then removed to one at the southeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 11th Street; the Eastern Hospital on the west side of 14th between K Street and Potomac Avenue southeast. Anniversary Oration, J. M. Toner, p. 53.

[5] A cholera hospital was established in Georgetown on the west side of 32d just south of M Street, and also one in Alexandria at the northeast corner of Fairfax and Gibbon streets. Toner's Anniversary Oration.

[6] Sept. 24, 1832.

Some three weeks after Jackson entered upon his second term the treasury building was destroyed by fire. As the flames were discovered about two o'clock on the morning of March 30, 1833, it was supposed at first that their origin was accidental. Subsequent developments, however, led to the arrest of Richard H. White, charged with setting the building on fire for the purpose of destroying fraudulent pension papers. Four successive trials were held, but a conviction was not secured, because of the statute of limitation.[1] From the conditions revealed, it was quite apparent the building was inadequately protected at night. There was but a single watchman, who was allowed to sleep after he had made a round of the building at ten o'clock.[2] A large part of the papers was carried from the building by the willing hands of people who lived in the vicinity, and the next day was removed to a row of five houses on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 14th and 15th streets, where for a time a guard of soldiers from the regular army protected the building at night. Equally primitive and ineffective was the fire protection. As there were no night watchmen within the building, so there were none on the outside, or even at the Franklin fire engine house on the public space at the southeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, which had been built by public money, and supplied with an engine from the same source, for the protection of the treasury and state buildings.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 29, 1837. Message of the mayor.

[2] Remarkable trial of Richard Lawrence, New York, 1835.

[3] *Intelligencer*, April 21, 1835.

[4] The same, Nov. 30, 1835.

[5] The same, Jan. 6, 1837, Dec. 29, 1837, and Nov. 20, 1838.

The members of the company of citizens who volunteered their services to handle the fire apparatus were sound asleep in their beds, with no provision for being awakened. As it happened, a citizen, passing in the vicinity, saw the flames and apparently familiar with the practice of the fire company, went to Fuller's Hotel on the corner opposite and got the key of the engine-house. He also secured a pair of horses, probably from the hotel stables that were in the rear fronting on 14th Street, and in twenty minutes after he first saw the fire, he estimated, the engine was at the building, the first to arrive.

---

[1] Register of Debates, p. 1412, Jan. 18, 1837.

[2] 22d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 22, Dec. 12, 1834. Report on the burning of the treasury building.

Some time after that another government-owned engine, located on the Western Market Square, Pennsylvania Avenue and 20th Street, designed for the protection of the war and navy buildings, put in an appearance with its volunteer company, known as the Union, while still later the third government engine, located in a government-owned building on the capitol grounds, south of that building, and operated by the Columbia Fire Co., reached the burning structure. There is no record of the appearance on this occasion of the other fire companies, the Anacostia or navy yard on Virginia Avenue, between the navy yard and the Marine Barracks, and the Perseverance, the latter occupying a building in Centre Market Square erected and equipped by the city government and citizens.

It seems probable, however, the Perseverance Co. turned out, as there is mention of another company being present besides one from Georgetown. The two pumps in the vicinity of the treasury building were soon exhausted, and the new water-supply from Franklin Square was tested by attaching a hose to a hydrant on 15th Street, but the stream was so feeble that it was of no avail.[1] Under the circumstances there was nothing to be done except to allow the fire to take its course, and so the old structure, which, as claimed at the time, was not very substantial in its construction, soon became a ruin. However, on Tuesday following the early morning fire of Sunday the department was open for business in the rented houses which were destined to be its home for six years. At least they were the headquarters of the department, which had outgrown the old building so that its bureaus were scattered about the city.[2] The third session after the fire had nearly ended before congress made provision to repair the loss.[1] The cause of the delay was due to the variety of views advanced. It was not merely the question of replacing the treasury department building, but also of making provision for the expansion in the executive branch of the government that had been steadily going on, and had caused the four department buildings to overflow into rented quarters, and had given force to the appeal for a building for the patent office. It was proposed to bring all the departments under one roof by erecting one large building in Lafayette Square or on the portion of the reservation south of the White House between 15th and 17th streets, or else on the public square between F, G, 7th and 8th streets.[2]

---

[1] A building for the Franklin Engine Co. was erected in 1828 and then a hydraulion engine was purchased. A new building for the Union Co. was erected by congress in 1837 at the southeast corner of 19th and H streets and is the only one of these early structures that remains.

[2] Three years later the treasury department was said to be occupying about a dozen private houses and the war department some six or eight. *Intelligencer*, Jan. 27, 1836.

Then it was proposed to erect a treasury building with two wings, one for the post-office department and the other for the department of state. Plans were presented from the rival architects, William P. Elliot and Robert Mills, both of whom had been in the employ of the government, the latter as a draughtsman in the office of Latrobe, when he was architect of the capitol, and the former a draughtsman in the patent office. As the author of designs of important structures in various parts of the country, Robert Mills had gained a reputation for professional skill and taste which was borne out by his work in Washington.

In the year 1836, when his design for the treasury building was accepted, he was successful in winning a competition for a design of a monument in honor of the first president, which the Washington National Monument Society, organized three years before as the result of a meeting of citizens of Washington held in the city hall, proposed to erect. At that time an organized effort was begun to carry out the patriotic purpose which had been considered by congress from time to time since it was first proposed by the continental congress in 1783, but no definite result had been reached.

---

[1] Stats., 5, 115, July 4, 1836.

[2] 23d Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 90, Feb. 5, 1835; 24th Cong., 2d Sess., Senate Doc. No. 10, Dec. 7, 1836; 25th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 38, Dec. 21, 1837.

The year before the society was formed congress, in the enthusiasm of the observance of the centennial anniversary of Washington's birth, had commissioned Horatio Greenough to make a statue, which nine years later was placed in the rotunda of the capitol. Despairing of being able to secure, through congress, a memorial that was thought worthy of the distinguished services of "the first citizen," to use the phrase of Chief Justice John Marshall in accepting the election as first president of the society,[1] the citizens of Washington undertook the task. By appeals to the people of the country for dollar subscriptions, by the year 1838 a fund of $30,779 was secured.[2]

As it proved, the idea of Mills, of an obelisk shaft five hundred feet high, rising from a colonnaded building one hundred feet high, was carried out, with the omission of the ornamented base. That feature was not adopted by the society, as its purpose was to build a shaft.

The house committee, finding it impossible to reconcile conflicting interests if a change in the site of the treasury building was made, passed the troublesome question over to the final decision of the president. No doubt the president was influenced by the action of the house committee when he directed that the building be erected on ground covered in part by the old structure. At the same time he made no change in the plans of the proposed structure prepared by Robert Mills, and which, in order to provide the required number of rooms, covered the entire frontage along 15th Street, and with its wing extended so far south as to block the vista of the capitol and the White House along Pennsylvania Avenue.

[1] History of the Washington Monument National Society, 57th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 224, Feb. 6, 1903, p. 22.

[2] The other officers of the society were: first vice-president, Judge William Cranch; second, John P. Van Ness; third, W. W. Seaton; treasurer, Samuel H. Smith; secretary, George Watterston; board of managers, General Thomas S. Jessup, Colonel James Kearney, Colonel Nathan Towson, Colonel Archibald Henderson, Matthew St. Clair Clarke, John McClelland, Thomas Munroe, Colonel George Bomford, Roger C. Weightman, Peter Force, William Brent, William A. Bradley and Thomas Carbery.

This result was recognized as a defect, a marring of the plan of the city, both by the architect and the house committee,[1] and was one of the reasons given by the committee a year later, for recommending that the work be stopped and the portion of the walls that had been erected taken down. However, congress failed to act, although a less radical course was open than the one proposed, by reducing the size of the structure to proportions more suited to the building space.

At any rate, years later the building of the south wing might have been omitted if there had been in congress or in the country an appreciation of the artistic importance and value in avoiding such a mutilation of the city's plan. Within the past third of a century the erection of the state, war and navy department destroyed the vista of the White House along New York Avenue, so that there is no justification for going back to the tradition which represents the choleric and arbitrary Jackson thrusting his cane in the ground on the treasury site and declaring, in the accepted Jacksonian fashion, that the building should be located there, in order to find an instance of public and official indifference to the canons of good taste.

If the building had been designed for the site, not only would the noble sweep of the avenue not have been interrupted, but the building itself would have been given a setting of ground instead of being planted directly on the street. However, the latter error was repeated when at this period congress provided for the erection of a building for the patent office. The site on the square between 7th, 8th, F and G streets was specifically named in the bill. The design of William P. Elliot for this noble structure was adopted, but the superintendence of the construction of both the treasury and patent office buildings was intrusted to Mr. Mills.

Following the current practice, the commissioner of public buildings, at that time William Noland, was directed to disburse the money. In the summer of 1836, a few weeks after the appropriations became available, a beginning was made of both buildings. A decade and a half had passed since a building for the use of the executive departments had been erected. Not only in the size but in the character of the construction and the material used, the new buildings, as compared with those previously built, illustrated the growth in population and in wealth.

---

[1] 25th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 737, March 29, 1838.

While recognizing the necessity for larger and more substantial structures in providing the money to erect spacious buildings fireproof in construction, congress also directed that sandstone should be used in the exterior, as had been done in the two principal public buildings, "provided a cheaper or more suitable material cannot be found." At the close of the first season's work and as winter set in fire again did its work and laid in ashes the Blodget Hotel building, which in its enlarged form had been the home for so many years of the post-office department, the patent office and the city post-office. This time the accidental origin of the fire was not questioned.[1] The City Hotel, or Fuller's, at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, was leased for the post-office department, while the patent office found a place in the chamber of the city council and in other rooms in the west section of the city hall, occupied by the mayor of the city and other officials.[1] For a year the city post-office occupied a dwelling on the west side of 7th Street, a short distance north of D Street, less than a block south of its former location. In the course of a year another removal was made to Masonic Hall, the southwest corner of Louisiana Avenue and John Marshall Place.[1] In the course of a little more than two years congress provided for the erection of a building on the site of the post-office department, but like the treasury and the patent office buildings only one side of what subsequently became a quadrangular structure was built. Again the choice of materials was left to the president, but no doubt, guided by the discussions in congress, where a change from the sandstone age to the marble age in public buildings was advocated, marble was selected as the material with which to execute the plans made for this building by Robert Mills. The motive of the change was not that marble was more dignified and distinguished than sandstone, but that it was less costly in the first instance, and besides did not involve the expense at intervals of applying a coat of paint.[1] During the summer of 1839 the treasury building was being occupied, and by the opening of the next year the models of patents were moved into their new home in the patent office building.[2] For almost a decade, up to 1834, congress had been appropriating, year after year, large sums of money to be expended for improvements in the city, making a record that was unequalled up to that time. More attention had been given to interests in the District that were not strictly federal than ever before. It was recognized that the department buildings destroyed by fire must be replaced, and on a larger scale, owing to the growth in the government service. The inconvenience and annoyance due to the condition of Pennsylvania Avenue were so generally realized that the money was voted for this improvement without eliciting a word of ill-natured or narrow comment reflecting upon federal and District relations. Two years after the avenue had been macadamized and was beginning to show the effects of wear, especially in clouds of dust in dry weather and a covering of mud in the rainy season, the familiar inquiry was heard on the floor of the house, Why the people of Washington ought not to be expected to do as the people of other cities do, keep their own streets in repair.[3] More than a decade passed before any more money was spent on Pennsylvania Avenue, except when congress, soon after the macadamizing was done, made provision for crossings of flagstones and for a new bridge over the Tiber at 2d Street. The dust-and-mud nuisance was abated as much as possible by funds contributed by citizens. However, in spite of unlighted streets and the clouds of dust or the depths of mud and the slighting estimate of the city expressed from time to time on the floor of congress, the life at Washington, with its opportunities of meeting the most interesting men and women of the period, was wonderfully attractive. The city had its warm friends in congress. No doubt in many instances it was the zeal of a convert. There were individuals who perhaps underwent the same change in their opinions about the city as a large number of citizens had in regard to General Jackson. When his coming was expected in the spring of 1829, it was thought that the feeling of apprehension and uncertainty of the community was expressed in the text, "When Christ drew near the city he wept over it," chosen for a discourse on current conditions delivered by Rev. Robert Little, the pastor of the First Unitarian Church.[1] Eight years later, as the result of a popular dollar subscription, a portrait of Andrew Jackson was placed in the city hall, "as a mark of gratitude" on the part of citizens for his active interest in their behalf.[2] At that time scarcely a year had passed since congress had relieved the three towns of the burden of the canal debt, and the commendation of the president of that measure to congress was held in grateful remembrance. Early in the same year the relief bill became a law, the president laid the corner-stone of a proposed town at the southern end of the Long Bridge, where it was intended to establish a commercial centre, a port for the trade of the west that was expected to be brought down on the canal.[3] But Jackson City, as the projectors, mainly New York men, called it, had from the start the suspicion and jealousy of Georgetown and Alexandria,[4] and when, a few weeks later, application was made to congress for a charter, the enterprise was denounced as a pecuniary speculation, connecting the name of the president "with the bogs and swamps and frogs of Jackson City."[1] The great stone placed there on the 12th of January, 1836, when the high wind and roar of the waves on the shore nearly drowned the voice of the orator of the day, George Washington Parke Custis, represented the total sum of the material efforts to found the town. For congress not alone failed to place its approval upon the scheme, but also failed to support the president's ambitious plan to replace the bridge with a new structure to cost one million dollars. The following year came the great financial panic, and in that trying time whatever vitality the enterprise had oozed out.[2] As to the social relations of the president's family, the latter being Andrew Jackson Donelson, the president's secretary, and his wife and their children, and occasionally the wife of the president's adopted son, the White House doors were hospitably open. The social rules that for twelve years had to a certain extent limited the social life of the president's family were laid aside. Invitations were accepted and calls were made.[3] For the first two years the feeling against Mrs. Eaton, the wife of the secretary of war, was a source of social bitterness and embarrassment. To say that the women who believed the unsubstantiated charges against the good name of the beautiful and fascinating and at the same time unconventional and high-spirited Mrs. Eaton were successful in the stand taken against her, is only repeating what is one of the commonplaces of such social episodes. Finally after the cabinet changes had been made, which this incident as well as politics made necessary, and Mrs.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 16, 1836.

[2] The same, June 9, 1837. The first or basement floor in the west wing was then fitted up for the city offices.

[3] When Dr. James S. Gunnell, who like Dr. Jones, whom he replaced, was a practising physician, was appointed city postmaster in 1839, the office was removed to the building at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 12th Street, where A. Fuller was conducting the Fountain Inn. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 6, p. 173.

---

[1] *Congressional Globe*, p. 186, Feb. 11, 1839.

[2] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 316.

[3] Register of Debates, p. 4393, June 6, 1834.

---

[1] William Winston Seaton, p. 210.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 18, 1837.

[3] The same, Nov. 4, 1835, and Jan. 11 and 29, 1836. See also *Globe* and *Telegraph*.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 5, 1835, and Jan. 12, 1836.

---

[1] Register of Debates, p. 3002, March 29, 1836.

[2] Eleven years later in an advertisement of the trustees offering for sale Holmes Island, "or more recently known as Jackson City," it is stated, "the improvements consist of a comfortable dwelling house with stables and other outbuildings." (*Intelligencer*, Sept. 2, 1847.) Five years later no change had been made in the property. (The same, Jan. 3, 1852.)

[3] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 306.

Eaton was no longer a factor in official social life, Washington society resumed its normal course.

On the morning of the 4th of March, 1837, Van Buren left his residence on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 19th and 20th streets, one of the seven buildings, and entered a phaeton built from the wood of the frigate *Constitution* and presented by the democracy of New York. Upon reaching the White House he was joined by the president, and with the escort of two companies of infantry and one of cavalry, volunteer organizations of the District, he proceeded to the capitol. Under bright skies and with the balmy air of an early spring day, the little company proceeded along the avenue lined with cheering crowds. The inaugural delivered on the east portico was heard with distinctness by a great throng of people. Upon the return of the new president and his predecessor to the White House a reception was held.[1] Then Mr. Van Buren returned to his residence, leaving the presidential mansion for the use of his predecessor, who remained there four days before setting out upon the journey to his home in Tennessee.[2] The new president was a familiar figure in the life of the city, where he had lived during his service as senator, secretary of state and vice-president.

A widower like Jackson, the lady of the White House was the wife of Abraham Van Buren, the son of the president, who was his private secretary. The president's tact in social matters and his excellent taste gave the White House functions a grace and dignity that were sometimes lacking during the previous eight years. He continued the drawing-rooms, as Jackson had done, but returned to the earlier practice of not accepting social invitations, although he introduced the custom of dining with the heads of departments and foreign ministers.[3] The fall following the inauguration Mrs. James Madison, after an absence of twenty years, her husband having died a year before, again established her home in Washington, where she spent the twelve years that remained of life. In the meantime the house at Madison Place and H Street, built by her brother-in-law, Richard Cutts, had come into the possession of Mr. Madison, and here his widow made her home. At once the house became one of the social centres of the city, and on the first New Year's day after she came there to live the custom was established of going from the White House to call on Mrs. Madison.[1] No doubt Mrs. Madison was interested in watching the progress of the erection of a residence which Matthew St. Clair Clarke was erecting on H Street, just east of St. John's Church. It was quite the largest structure of the kind attempted in the city, but before it could be carried out as designed, financial misfortune overtook Mr. Clarke, and the house was left standing for some time in an unfinished state.[2] For some years Mr. Clarke was the clerk of the house, but at that time had just begun printing the volumes of American Archives, which Peter Force edited.

---

[1] *Intelligencer* and *Globe*, March 6, 1837.

[2] *Intelligencer*, March 8, 1837. A ball in the evening at Carusi's closed the ceremonies of the day.

[3] Martin Van Buren, American Statesmen series, p. 338.

---

[1] Adams Memoirs, Vol. 9, pp. 418 and 462.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 22, 1837. Tayloe's In Memoriam, p. 177. The house though changed is still standing and is now No. 1525 H Street.

CHAPTER X

PARTISAN POLITICS AND THE CITY

At no period in the history of the District had political differences so strong an influence on its relations with congress as during the year 1840. To the tide of public opinion which swept the Whig party into power the District sent such rills and streamlets as lay within its capacity. Delegates were chosen to represent the District at the great convention of Whig young men in Baltimore, when the log-cabin and hard-cider campaign was begun with immense enthusiasm.[1] But before that notable gathering was held, what was looked upon as an attempt to chill the local ardor for the Whig cause was made in congress, where the Democratic party was still in control, although by a slender majority. This was the motive attributed to Edmund Burke of New Hampshire in offering in the house a resolution for the appointment of a committee to consider the expediency of removing the seat of government to some location on the Ohio River. The resolution further denied the constitutional power of congress to appropriate public money in the District except for public purposes, but admitted that congress had the power to authorize the people of the District to levy taxes upon themselves for all local and municipal purposes.[2] Nothing was done in congress in regard to this resolution, but when its author was charged in the public press with playing politics, [3] in the course of a reply through the same medium he stated as his conviction that as the legislatures of the New England states have not the authority to apply general revenues to local objects, the same principle applied to congress and the District. After giving a list of local appropriations by congress, such as to pay the canal debt of the three towns, to aid local improvements, to buy the Long Bridge and so on, he asked "if it is not high time that this exorbitant system of begging and plunder was effectually checked."[1] Beyond a couple of newspaper communications in reply,[2] Mr. Burke and his views in regard to the District caused no further comment. A few weeks later a mayoralty campaign was entered into that proved to be one of the most exciting in the annals of such events. Ward meetings were held by the Whigs and also a general meeting, and as a result W. W. Seaton, the junior proprietor and editor of the *Intelligencer*, was nominated for mayor.[3] When the election day came around, the Seaton ticket was elected by an overwhelming vote, while John C. Rives, the junior editor of the *Globe*, the organ of the administration, failed of election as member of the board of aldermen.[4] For the second time, the first being the election in 1830 of Van Ness as a Jackson man, a municipal election in Washington was given a national significance. It was heralded in the party papers as a great Whig victory.[5] The intense feeling prevailing gave what, under other circumstances, would have been a ludicrous turn to an annual event in Georgetown, the cart men's parade, when it was made into a caricature of the Whigs. After all, the importance given to the election of a Whig mayor was because it occurred in the midst of the most stirring, picturesque political campaign ever witnessed in the United States. For it was no new thing to have a representative of that party at the head of the affairs of the city. Peter Force had just completed two terms or four years as mayor, and had followed the one term of William A.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 3, 1840.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, p. 254, March 9, 1840.

[3] *Intelligencer*, March 27, 1840.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 3, 1840.

[2] The same, April 6 and 8, 1840.

[3] The same, May 16, 1840.

[4] The same, June 2 and 4, 1840. Mr. Seaton's opponent, James Hoban, was a son of the architect of the White House and a member of the bar.

[5] *The Globe*, June 13, 1840. Communication signed Democrat.

Bradley, so ever since the middle of Andrew Jackson's second term Whigs had filled the chief local office.

In addition to these political activities the Whigs had what would be in modern days a congressional campaign committee, as the Central Tippecanoe Club of Washington occupied two rooms in the city hall, where the Whig members of congress franked documents.[1] Although the Democrats maintained a similar organization, yet that was quite a different thing, as they were the dominant party in congress. Later on, Whig enthusiasm put up a log cabin on the public grounds in front of Centre Market with a liberty pole 107 feet in height.[2] A few days after the mayoralty election a memorial signed by 386 citizens of Washington was presented in the senate, praying that the charter of the city be changed so as to remove the property qualification both for voters and office-holders.[3] As the term of the city charter expired that year, similar memorials had been presented earlier in the session favoring manhood suffrage, as well as one from the city authorities, opposing the removal of a property qualification for office-holders. Beyond a discussion in the senate nothing was done.[4] But now that the city election was over and the Whigs had won, suffrage in Washington took on a new interest in congress. The memorial asking that franchise restrictions be removed was at once referred to a special committee, and in less than two days a bill was reported, providing for complete manhood suffrage. The *Intelligencer* asserted that in addition the bill provided for a new election in October, in the hope that an unrestricted vote would result in the displacing of the Whig mayor by a Democrat.[5] In a memorial protesting against the bill the city council, while questioning the expediency of the proposed extension of suffrage, yet did so in a mild fashion, and rested its objection mainly on the lack of time for consideration by the people.[6] Politics aside, it is quite evident

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 17, 1840.

[2] The same, Oct. 7, 1840.

[3] 26th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 518, June 5, 1840.

[4] *Congressional Globe*, pp. 226 and 534, Feb. 18, 1840.

[5] July 24 and Aug. 12, 1840.

[6] 26th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 609, July 14, 1840.

the existing franchise restrictions had by this time come to be looked upon by citizens as anomalous. Not merely because manhood suffrage had been adopted in a majority of the states, or even that it had been the practice for the past thirty years in the neighboring state of Maryland, but because of local conditions. For at the recent city election, when the largest vote in a municipal election had been cast, only nineteen per cent of the white male population had voted.[1] At the same time a difference of opinion existed as to the scope of the change, and especially whether the property qualification should be removed from those chosen to fill the offices as well as from the voters. The *Intelligencer*, the organ of the Whigs, the dominant local party, was opposed to placing propertyless citizens in office, while the *Globe*, that represented the opposition, favored the removal of all restrictions.[2] As will be noted, the initiative in the attempted removal legislation came from congress, and also, in part, for the extension of the franchise, a practical demonstration of the possibilities of injury to District interests from an unfriendly disposition in its legislature. As usual, the city wanted something from congress. Two matters of great importance were then before that body. The draw of the Long Bridge over the Virginia channel had been swept away in February, and the Little Falls Bridge had at the same time yielded to the force of the angry waters.[3] The tide of travel and of business between the District and the southern shore of the Potomac was shut off. A temporary provision was, however, made by citizens in the case of the Long Bridge, by building out from the section left standing inclined ways for vehicles to pass to the level of a steam ferry-boat that ran to the Virginia shore. It proved to be more than temporary, as the session passed without anything being done to repair the bridge. At the next session, which brought to a close for a time the control of Congress by the Democrats, and in the closing hours, a clause was inserted in an appropriation bill providing money for the repair of that structure. As it proved inadequate, a further delay was caused.[1]

---

[1] The total vote was 1184, while according to the census of 1840 the number of white males was 8196.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 12, 1840; *The Globe*, June 13, 1840.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 12 and 13, 1840.

A District interest that was looked upon at that time as of still deeper concern was the renewal of the charters of the banks which had reached the end of the two years' extension period that congress had adopted as its policy since 1836. Instead of continuing the bank charters congress caused general dismay by providing for winding up the business of the different institutions, and in the meanwhile forbidding them to receive deposits or to discount notes.[2] The action of congress in depriving the District of all banking facilities was not entirely due to the resentment of the dominant party over the Whig activity in the District.[3] The Democrats looked on the District bank situation as a mere phase of the great struggle then in progress throughout the country between what was termed the corporation and the individual. But as was declared on the floor of the senate, the discussion and determination of the District bank question will have a powerful influence on the destinies of the Nation.[4] In illustrating his contention of the hopelessness of trying to regulate banks, Thomas H. Benton declared in the senate that the District banks, when confronted with the clause in the existing charter prohibiting the issue of notes under $5, "put the matter into the hands of a lawyer, and he told them how to get around and evade the provision, and that was to strike off those six, seven, eight and nine dollar notes."[5] At the next session, when the Whigs were in the majority, the charters of the District banks were continued until 1844 with the condition that specie payments must be maintained, following in this particular the practice then current in extending state bank charters.[1] When that time arrived and the Whig majority had dwindled, the District banks were given authority to wind up their affairs,[2] and that proved to be the end of banks under congressional laws in the District until the enactment of the national bank law. However, the District banks did not go out of existence after 1844, but as partnership concerns, continued the banking business as heretofore, even to the issue of a circulating medium.[3]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 2, 1841. In contrast to such a dilatory course in a matter involving the vital interests of the community was the action of the Georgetown corporation, the owner of the Little Falls Bridge, in making provision for rebuilding that structure within six months after it was carried away. Georgetown Ordinance, Aug. 1, 1840.

[2] Stats., 6, 802, July 3, 1840.

[3] *Intelligencer*, July 6 and Sept. 17, 1840.

[4] *Congressional Globe*, p. 298, April 1, 1840.

[5] The same, p. 464.

The right to do a banking business was claimed under the common law. As the banks were left undisturbed for nearly twenty years it is evident congress acquiesced in this construction of the law. The scope of the business of one of the banks was proposed to be enlarged, when the president of the Patriotic Bank, G. C. Grammer, announced the opening, in connection with the bank, of a savings institution "on the plans adopted in the northern cities."[4] A little more than a month later the Washington City Savings Bank, the first institution in the city exclusively for savings, was opened on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 4½ and 6th streets northwest.[5] Although the people of the District had welcomed the test made in the District of the system of federal aid to public works when the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal was started in 1828, yet when the further legislative experiment was made by the law of July 3, 1840, with the result of depriving them of all banking facilities provided for by statute, it was bitterly resented.[6] For the first time the people of the entire District were arrayed in open opposition to congress. In Alexandria the loss of the banks was specially felt, and there great anger and excitement were shown.[1] At a town meeting held in that place resolutions were adopted declaring that if congress looked upon the District "as a field of legislative experiment, the people of the several states are called upon to relieve us of political bondage."[2] While the only appeal to congress from the citizens of the District asking to be freed from federal rule came from Alexandria County, still a few days later a bill was taken up by that body to authorize the president to ascertain the opinion of the people of the District outside of Washington on the question of retrocession.[3] But congress did not act. Two weeks after the Alexandria citizens had expressed disapproval of the bank policy, a public meeting of citizens of Washington was held, with Mayor Seaton presiding. Then it was declared in resolutions adopted "that the course pursued at the late session of congress towards the District is insulting to our character, derogatory to our rights and subversive of our prosperity."[4] "Political oppression," it was declared, would be met by "moral resistance," and it was decided to hold a delegated convention to consider the wrongs suffered at the hands of congress. Such an assemblage was held, but it was only attended by delegates from Washington and the two counties,[5] and when, a few weeks later, the convention again assembled, only those from Washington appeared, while letters were read from the authorities of the other two towns and from the two counties, declining to participate, as they "had resolved upon retrocession as their final and only redress from legislative wrongs, injuries and insults inflicted upon them by the congress of the United States."[6] The

---

[1] Stats., 5, 449, Aug. 25, 1841.

[2] The same, p. 677, June 17, 1844.

[3] 28th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 162, Feb. 25, 1845.

[4] *Intelligencer*, March 6, 1847. The interest paid on twelve months' deposit was four per cent, on six months, three and one half per cent, and less than three months, three per cent. No sum over $100 was to be withdrawn without ten days' notice and no sums less than $5 to be withdrawn at any time.

[5] *Intelligencer*, April 23, 1847. The partners were Lewis Johnson, Stanislaus Murray, Edward Simms and John Purdy. Interest paid for any calendar month at four per cent.

[6] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 12, 1840.

---

[1] *Congressional Globe*, p. 534, July 17, 1840.

[2] *Intelligencer*, July 13, 1840. Also petition of citizens of Alexandria County, praying for retrocession. 26th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 614, July 16, 1840.

[3] *Congressional Globe*, p. 534, July 17, 1840.

[4] *Intelligencer*, July 29, 1840.

[5] The same, Aug. 11, 1840.

[6] The same, Sept. 2, 1840. The address, as finally prepared by the convention, was said to express the views of citizens of the District

Georgetown citizens had already gone on record in an address to the people of the United States as having reached the conclusion that the bank situation and other evils were due to the system of government from which they asked relief by being restored to Maryland.[1] To supply ammunition for such a campaign was probably the motive of the writer of a newspaper communication, proposing that the citizens of Georgetown open a subscription list for a fund to defray the expense of preparing a history of the town.[2] While at this crisis the citizens of Washington depended upon "moral resistance," the citizens of the other sections of the District west of Rock Creek and the Potomac reached the conclusion to rid themselves of congressional government. Two years before this time the citizens of Georgetown and of Washington County, west of Rock Creek, as they had in 1826, came to the same conclusion. The immediate cause was the rebuilding by congress of the Long Bridge in spite of the protests of Georgetown citizens, another defeat in the long contest carried on against the location of a bridge south of the town. For, as declared in the resolutions then adopted by the town council in accordance with instructions received from a public meeting, "without reference to the political advantages of retrocession to Maryland, the pecuniary interest and general prosperity of our citizens will be promoted."[3] A memorial on behalf of a joint committee representing the town and a section of Washington County was presented to the Maryland legislature, asking to be restored to that state,[4]

---

except those in Georgetown and Alexandria. The same, Sept. 17, 1840.

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 3, 1840.

[2] The same, Aug. 31, 1840. Eleven years later the centennial of the laying out of the town was allowed to pass without an effort being made to have a history prepared. But in this respect Georgetown did not differ from the other two towns.

[3] Resolution of Georgetown council, March 26, 1838. The committee appointed to act with a committee from the county was composed of John Carter, R. P. Dunlop, Thomas Turner, John Marbury, Clement Cox, Samuel McKenney and Otho M. Linthicum. Also see speech of Samuel McKenney before the general meeting. Georgetown, 1838.

[4] Journal, House, Maryland legislature, p. 198, Feb. 5, 1840.

and in the course of two weeks a favorable report was made by the committee, but only to be laid on the table. It is quite evident that a few months later, when the bank question arose, Georgetown still had hopes of action by Maryland, because early the following year the committee was authorized to renew its appeal at the next session of the legislature.[1] At any rate the town declined to coöperate with Washington on the ground that retrocession was expected. While no doubt Georgetown resented as deeply as the other towns the bank policy of congress, yet a deeper and older source of discontent and unrest was to be found in the bitterness of the unavailing contest carried on for so many years to maintain the commerce of the town by the river. Under the government of congress it was asserted the navigation of the river had been impaired by the erection of the Long Bridge, an impediment in sail navigation as well as causing an increase in the channel deposits. The town had lost its trade, and now by the encouragement and aid of the national legislature the Alexandria Aqueduct was nearing completion, and it seemed probable the expected trade over the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal would pass through their town to the rival port of Alexandria.[2] As Maryland had now become a dominant power in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal enterprise, it was felt she would care for her own. At least, Georgetown would not be opposed in the legislative halls of Maryland, as it was in congress, by the combined forces of Washington and Alexandria or the superior influence of Washington alone. But Maryland had gone into internal improvements to such an extent that financial embarrassments had begun to trouble her, and which culminated, three years later, in a decision to get rid of her internal improvement obligations.[3] This, however, was found to be much easier to decree than to accomplish. It is quite evident that this was a factor in the disappointing course pursued by the legislature in dealing with the Georgetown retrocession proposal.

---

[1] Resolution of Georgetown council, Jan. 23, 1841.

[2] Speech of Samuel McKenney.

[3] *Intelligencer*, March 15, 1843.

The same condition of financial and trade troubles in the case of Alexandria, six years after the bank episode, inspired largely the movement which resulted in the restoration of the town and county of Alexandria to the state of Virginia. For in order to secure the coal trade from Cumberland, when the great western canal was finished, the town of Alexandria had burdened itself with debt to build the Alexandria Canal and the aqueduct. After twelve years of labor that costly, and for that day, difficult engineering work had been completed.[1] Then, owing to lack of money, the work on the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal stopped while still short of the proposed terminus at Cumberland, and the money put into the Alexandria section was unproductive. The situation was a desperate one.[2] As congress had already contributed to the enterprise and there was no prospect of help coming from that source, the town turned to the legislature of Virginia. There it met a warm welcome, and in a few days after the receipt of the resolutions of the common council of Alexandria asking the consent of the legislature to the return of Alexandria County to the state, a bill to that effect became a law.[3] Then congress passed a bill restoring Alexandria County to the state of Virginia, and the citizens by special vote gave their consent, and the thing was done.[4] The measure gave rise to but slight discussion in congress.

It may also be said there was but slight opposition, although the committee representing the corporation of Washington before congress was instructed to give attention to the subject, as in the end it might "prove the first step towards abrogating or destroying the compact by which the seat of government was permanently located in the District, and result in the removal of the capital to some other place." [1] Such considerations as congress, having exhausted its constitutional powers in selecting the District, therefore could not change the location, or that the cession of the District was a contract between the United States and the two states, were discussed in the house report [2] and also in the memorial of the committee of Alexandria appended to that report. Yet, after all, the emphasis, especially by the citizens, was laid upon the disadvantages of being dependent on congress for legislation. The loss of political rights was not overlooked and while the citizens east of the Potomac, it was asserted, are in some measure compensated by being citizens "of the metropolis of a great and noble republic, yet with the citizens of Alexandria when they go abroad, or their sons are sent to the various literary institutions in the states, from a sense of their degraded political condition, they are induced to pass themselves as citizens of Virginia." [3] In other words, Alexandria County had been given an inferior place, and was forgotten and neglected by congress. How different was the situation when once within the jurisdiction of Virginia. At the very next session after the restoration, the legislature came to the relief of Alexandria by subscribing for a large block of the stock of the Alexandria Canal Co.[4] and at the following session guaranteed some of the company's bonds.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 6, 1843. Alexandria Canal formally opened.

[2] The population of Alexandria in 1840 was 8459, while the corporate debt was in the neighborhood of a million. (*Congressional Globe*, May 8, 1846, Appendix, p. 778.) At that time Washington's population numbered 23,634 and the funded debt was $820,501. (Laws of Corporation, 37th Council, 1839–1840.)

[3] Journal, House, Virginia legislature, Jan. 30 and Feb. 3, 1846.

[4] The commissioners appointed by the president of the United States, consisting of Robert Brackett, George Washington Parke Custis, G. W. D. Ramsay, George W. Smoot and James Roach, opened polls in Alexandria County, Sept. 1 and 2, 1846, from 10 to 6 P.M., when all free white male citizens of the United States and resident in the county six months prior to the election were entitled to vote. The vote for retrocession was 763 and against it 222. Journal, House, Virginia legislature, 1845–1846, Doc. No. 1, p. 49.

Some notion of the current expectations of the commercial benefits of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, even after years of disappointing delays, may be gathered from the course of a community like Alexandria that contributed a great sum of money and received practical help and encouragement both from congress and from the state of Virginia. While the coal trade from Seneca, Harpers Ferry and other points on the canal as it was completed had started several years before, yet it was not of course until 1850, when the waterway was opened to Cumberland, that through shipments were made. When that time arrived, Alexandria was alone prepared with a terminal. In spite of the fact that the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co. had spent half a million of dollars, some sixteen years before, in extending its canal through Georgetown and thence through the city of Washington to the city canal at the foot of 17th Street, yet when the canal was fully opened, there was no water in the Rock Creek basin.[1] In addition, the bridges spanning the canal were so low that all boats could not pass, and so the section between the Aqueduct Bridge and 32d Street, of limited wharf capacity, was the only available space to unload.[2] At intervals prior to 1855 enough water was in the Washington section of the canal to allow boats laden with wood and coal to reach Centre Market and also to pass on to the navy yard. After that year it ceased to be used.[3] It was not until 1867 that a change was made in the bridges over the Georgetown streets so that it was possible for all boats used on the canal to reach the basin. But in spite of the slowness and delay in the work the District towns had enough faith in the ultimate success of the enterprise to make, several years prior to and following 1850, contributions of money, both as individuals and as town corporations. Washington and Georgetown became responsible for the guarantee of a certain amount of tonnage, which was one of the conditions of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal bond issue of 1844. The Washington corporation also subscribed to a large block of these bonds.[1] Besides helping in the main work, the Washington corporation made valiant efforts to get the Washington City Canal into a navigable condition. Beginning about the year 1850, when the western canal was completed, over $100,000 of city money was spent, while congress appropriated $40,000.[2] The public attitude in regard to this work may further be gauged by an article that appeared in the *Intelligencer* of Nov. 1, 1848, which urged the importance of an Eastern Branch terminus for the coal trade, as it was declared, owing to the filling up of the Potomac River channel to Georgetown, "no large vessel ever loads entirely at the wharves, and when one ventures up to the Georgetown wharves, only a part of a cargo is taken, the balance after reaching the arsenal."

---

[1] Resolution of city council, May 28, 1846.

[2] 29th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 325, Feb. 25, 1846.

[3] The same, p. 6.

[4] Virginia Session Laws, March 1, 1847.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 2, 1850. The basin began a short distance south of K Street and was formed by a mole 1000 feet long, an extension of 30th Street in a southeasterly direction. At the extreme end was a lock across the mouth of Rock Creek.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 13, 1851.

[3] Communication from president of Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co., relating to the Washington Branch. Baltimore, 1871. Also Ordinance, Dec. 5, 1850.

With Georgetown out of the way, owing to the condition of the river, the great coal business, it was believed, must come in large part to Washington, as there would be left the competition only of Alexandria. It is not surprising then that public money was spent so freely and with general acquiescence on the city's continuation of the great western canal. To lessen the expense as well as to make the work more practicable, the width of the canal, which covered a large part of the area of the old mouth of Tiber Creek, was reduced from 160 to 130 feet, from 14th to 6th streets. At this time a survey was made with the view of making James Creek a branch of the city canal, as originally planned.[3] Besides providing an additional outlet to the Eastern Branch by this extension of the city's waterway, the city would be improved by the drainage of a swamp between two hundred and three hundred feet in width, bordering James Creek and stretching from I Street to the south, formed by the back-water of the river and the surface drainage. But nothing was done. Some seven years later the city authorities dug a ditch from the canal at Virginia Avenue and South Capitol Street through this swamp to P Street, as far as the grounds then recently added to the arsenal reservation, leaving the balance to be done by the government,[1] so that some seventy years after the line of the canal had been shown on the first city plan its entire extent was opened, with the exception of a small section. However, the important result of such an improvement at that time was the benefit to the property and the health of the city rather than the hope of increasing the facilities of a waterway that had been declared, a few months before the work was finished, to be "a nuisance and sooner or later it must be filled up or covered in." [2] For while the city canal had been for some years "one of the greatest sources of revenue to the corporation," yet during the nearly three decades of municipal ownership, it had been also a steady drain upon the corporation, a principal cause of debt increase. Its future was hopeless; for, after all, the object of municipal ownership and the expenditure of money, both by the city and by congress, had not been merely to provide facilities for local trade, but to bring the great western canal into the city. This could not be realized, as owing to the practical bankruptcy of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co., the section from the Washington canal basin to the Rock Creek basin was not in a condition to be used.

---

[1] City Ordinances, April 15, 1845, and April 14, 1847. At this period the corporate authorities of Washington asked that congress transfer to it the Chesapeake and Ohio stock once owned by the corporation, but that request was not granted. The three towns, however, continued for some time to send their representatives to the canal company directors' meetings.

[2] In Laws. Mayor's messages for 1852 and 1855. Robert Mills, the architect of the public buildings, was employed as engineer, as Latrobe had been in the earlier period. *Intelligencer*, July 21, 1851.

[3] City council resolution, April 26, 1851. Robert Mills' plan. *Intelligencer*, July 17, 1851.

It is quite evident the three towns suffered by the failure of the western canal, not only because the expected trade did not come, but on account of the large contributions to the canal proper possible only by borrowing, and in the case of Alexandria and Washington in providing a direct connection. After contracting a great debt, trade declined in Georgetown and Alexandria, and population remained almost stationary, while Washington grew and in comparison flourished. In these economic conditions rather than in the loss of political rights is to be found the explanation of the unrest and dissatisfaction in Georgetown and Alexandria with government by congress. To mend their fortunes, the plans to develop the natural resources must be carried out. More money was needed. This was the policy adopted in other parts of the country. Then, however, private capital was not sufficient or available, so it came about that the aid of state legislatures was sought, and it was by this means internal improvements of the day were carried on.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 29, 1859.

[2] *The Star*, Feb. 11, 1859.

[3] The same, Nov. 26, 1858.

Following the custom of the time, Georgetown and Alexandria appealed to congress, their legislature. The result was disappointing, and so naturally they hoped by returning to the states from which they had come they would improve their condition. While Washington fared no better than her sister towns in this particular, yet its growth and welfare were not dependent on trade and commerce. It prospered because it was the Nation's capital, and at that time the influence of such a centre was not of such volume as to extend throughout the District as it did in later years. It is an interesting subject of speculation as to what congress would have done if Georgetown had been backed up by the official approval of Maryland, just as Alexandria had behind it the legislative sanction of Virginia.

By the end of the decade following the failure, in 1840, of Georgetown to interest the state of Maryland in its welfare, the situation of the town had not improved. Although retrocession was still discussed, the need of money for improvements became so vital that "the influential men who in former times were retrocessionists have gone over to the opposite extreme — of amalgamation with Washington."

For, as the writer observed in explanation of this change, "bridges have to be raised [referring to those over the canal], the outlet made more commodious and sundry things done for which the people direct their eyes to congress or the Maryland assembly."[1] A few months later, at the close of the year

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 18, 1851.

1851, the mayor of the town, Henry Addison, at a public meeting called to discuss retrocession, favored such a course because "of the partial legislation of congress, and its neglect of Georgetown, whose interests were forgotten in the congressional regard for the well-being and advancement of the federal city." [1] But opinion was divided. Citizens were warned of the burden of taxes which they would be obliged to assume when they leave the District. For, unlike other American towns, they were free from state taxation. Four years later the agitation for annexation to Washington was again renewed without, however, any definite action. At that time the *Intelligencer* suggested that if the two towns were united, the metropolis should bear the name of George Washington.[2] While Alexandria had applied its governmental remedy to its economic ills and Georgetown was vainly seeking a similar remedy, changes in the form of government had not been given any public attention in Washington for more than a decade. In 1850, as a petition was being circulated asking congress to provide a territorial government, a public meeting was called by the mayor to consider the subject. No conclusion was reached. A resolution was voted down which proposed a form of government for the District similar to that of the territories or else a delegate in congress without the territorial form.[3] After this, years passed before the subject of a change in the government was revived.

As has been pointed out, economic considerations were the main factor in the open dissatisfaction felt in the District with government by congress prior to and following the year 1840. At the same time the political conditions which led to the sweeping Whig victory in 1840 had their influence, especially in Washington. For while the Whigs during the preceding twelve years of democratic ascendancy in national politics had been in control of the city government, it was not until the violence of feeling aroused in the campaign of 1840 that the dominant parties in congress and in the city became openly antagonistic. The strong feeling that swept the Whigs into power asserted itself in Washington in spite of the frowns and rebuffs of congress, as displayed in the District bank legislation and in the attempt to secure removal legislation. A couple of months after the triumphant election of Harrison preparations began to be made for the coming inauguration. As usual on such occasions, a meeting of subscribers to the inaugural ball was called and managers were chosen. But of the seventy-six citizens selected not one belonged to the Democratic party, although four years before, when Van Buren was inaugurated, Whig citizens had been given a place on the inaugural ball committee.[1] Such a course elicited unavailing protest. While maintaining an unbroken front against those who had opposed them in the recent contest, the victorious party fell to squabbling among themselves. Objection was made by the *Madisonian*, that was soon to become the administration organ, to placing the ball tickets at $10. Another committee was formed at a public meeting called for that purpose, and it was announced that at the People's Tippecanoe Ball the charge would be $5.[2] In the first flush of victory much of the enthusiasm of what is regarded as the most fervent campaign in American politics continued to inspire the jubilant Whigs. A great demonstration was made to mark the induction into office of the hero of Tippecanoe. A ball committee of large size had been appointed. But that was not enough, and so when the Whigs were called together in their log-cabin on Centre Market Square, to arrange for a reception to the president elect upon his arrival in the city on a preliminary visit, authority was given to call a public meeting for the purpose of arranging for the inaugural ceremonies. As the result of this meeting what may be described as the first inaugural committee, certainly in name if not in scope, was appointed.[3] As this committee had no care about the ball, and its sole duty was to plan the inaugural parade, more careful study was given to that feature. As one result in the order announcing the parade, for the first time places were assigned where the various units were directed to assemble.[1] These details had barely been completed when General Harrison reached the city on his way to visit his nephew, Benjamin Harrison, at Berkley, Va. He remained six days, and was the guest at Gadsby's of a committee of citizens. The heat of the campaign had not stirred the old general's blood to the extent of causing him to forget the respect due to the president of the United States, even though he had been the opponent in the recent campaign. The day after his arrival and, as it happened, the day when congress completed the electoral count, he hastened to the White House to call. President Van Buren returned the call the next day, and invited his successor to dine with him the following day.[2] While the heads of the two parties recognized the amenities of life, their partisans for the most part were still in fighting mood. On the occasion of the arrival in the city of General Harrison, the spokesman, W. W. Seaton, the mayor of the city and also editor of the Whig organ, referred, in the course of an address of welcome, to "the indignities and oppression" which the people of the District suffered because they "dared to think for themselves and publicly to avow their disapproval of the measures of the administration."[3] When the city council adopted, as was usual at the close of an administration, resolutions expressive of respect for the retiring president, the Whigs in mass meeting denounced this action, as it "grossly misrepresented the opinions, feelings and wishes of their constituents."[4] The mayor vetoed the resolutions, informing the council that he could not, with consistency and self-respect, sign it. A little more than a week later, however, the Democrats of the District, as members of political bodies and as individuals, called on President Van Buren at the White House, and expressed appreciation of the liberal spirit displayed by him towards the

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 1, 1851.

[2] The same, Oct. 6, 1855.

[3] The same, Feb. 10, 1850.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 13, 1841; *Daily Globe*, Feb. 3, 1845.

[2] List of committees. *Intelligencer*, Jan. 4 and 5; also the same, March 5, 1841. The $10 ball was held in the old theatre building on Louisiana Avenue, which was refitted for use as an assembly hall. The other ball was held at Carusi's.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 4, 19 and 26, 1841.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 3, 1841.

[2] The same, Feb. 12, 1841.

[3] The same, Feb. 10, 1841.

[4] The same, Feb. 19, 1841.

District.[1] Mr. Van Buren remained in the city some nine days after the inauguration.[2] There is no record that he attended the inauguration, and judging from the official program of the exercises at the capitol, prepared by the senate committee, he was not expected.[3] The president elect rode a horse in the procession, and upon his return from the capitol he did not go to the home of W. W. Seaton on E Street between 7th and 8th streets, where he spent a few days before the inauguration,[4] but went directly to the White House. No inaugural parade had ever passed over such a long route. Forming in the vicinity of the city hall, the procession went along E Street, where the president elect took his place in the line, and thence to 11th Street, to F Street, to 15th Street, and south to Pennsylvania Avenue and thence to the capitol.

It had been expected that military companies and especially Tippecanoe clubs from places outside of the District would be in the parade, and no doubt such an expectation, born of the enthusiasm of the hour, had much to do with the creation of an inaugural committee. As it proved, the National Greys of Philadelphia was the only military company that came, and to it therefore belongs the distinction of being the first organization outside of the District to take part in an inaugural parade.[5] The Whig prospects and hopes were blighted, as hardly a month passed of the new administration when General Harrison died. His successor, John Tyler, was soon out of harmony with the Whig party. The disclosure of his attitude in the veto of the bank measure was the occasion of much disorder in the senate, and one man in the gallery was placed under arrest.[1] That evening the town was stirred. A gathering of indignant Whigs, at what was known as the Log Cabin tavern, determined to go to the White House and make a demonstration. This decision coming to the ears of Mayor Seaton, he went to the tavern, and advised against such action. He supposed the project was abandoned and went home. About two o'clock that morning the more determined in the crowd, inflamed with liquor, decided to carry out the original purpose. So they marched up Pennsylvania Avenue from the vicinity of 6th Street, and stopping on their way to get more liquor, they continued to the White House, where they noisily gathered on the portico, and after hooting and hissing went away.[2] This insult to the president, as it was characterized, was denounced at a public meeting of citizens called by the mayor, and held the next day in front of the city hall.[3] On this occasion the citizens called attention to the need of a police, and urged that some system be established under the authority of the general government. For the disorderly gathering of drunken rowdies at the White House was, after all, a symptom of the change in the city, due to a larger population. Advantage was being taken of the entire lack of protection at night. Incendiary fires had become so common that a voluntary night patrol was formed.[4] As a necessary preliminary to such a service, a second story was added to the scale-house building on Centre Market Square, and it was then used as a guard-house in place of the one in Judiciary Square.[5] For while the latter building was the only lockup in the most populous ward in the city, yet it was in such a dilapidated state that it had not been in use for a year. The provision of this sort in the other wards was not much better, as the guard-houses were without means of being heated, and could only be used in mild weather.[6] While the disturbers of the rest of the president had no police to encounter that night, yet members of the party were subsequently arrested. When arraigned in the circuit court some weeks later, the charges were dismissed at the request of President Tyler, who, in a letter to the district attorney, Phillip R. Fendall, spoke of the occurrence as "one of those outbreaks of popular feeling, incident in some degree to our form of government, and entirely evanescent and harmless in character." [1] A week later, however, in his annual message to congress, the president called attention to the subject of providing "an efficient police" for the protection of the public buildings. From this recommendation came the legislation establishing what was termed the auxiliary guard, a police force paid for from the federal treasury and exclusively used for service at night.

---

[1] *Daily Globe*, March 8, 1841. This testimonial was the result of a call issued by John Ward, president of the Democratic Association. It seems probable this was the Democratic Association that figured in the next presidential campaign, of which J. E. Norris was secretary. (*Daily Globe*, Feb. 15, 1845.) Four years later the name was the Jackson Democratic Association, H. S. Davis, president (*Intelligencer*, April 13 and Aug. 2, 1848), and which is retained to the present day.

[2] *Madisonian*, March 16, 1841. Notice that the former president left the city for the north the 13th inst.

[3] *Daily Globe*, March 3, 1841.

[4] *Intelligencer*, April 24, 1841.

[5] The same, March 5, 1841.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 16, 1841.

[2] *The Madisonian*, Aug. 19, 1841.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 20, 1841.

[4] Mayor's message. In Laws, 1842.

[5] Ordinance, Sept. 23, 1840.

[6] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 7, 1840.

In the course of the discussion in congress of this measure no allusion was made to the White House affair, or any statement that the safeguarding was sought of a president whom the dominant party no longer regarded as its head. But the purpose, as shown in the discussion, was mainly to provide protection to public and private buildings, especially from fire. Before, however, the bill was finally completed, its scope was broadened so as to include the enforcement of the city police regulations. As was said in the course of the debate in the house, with reference to the destructive work of fire in the public buildings,[2] it had proved rather costly to pay a corps of men, as the department watchmen were termed, to sleep in the public buildings. Now it was time to have an outside force. It was the opinion of the committee [3] that the cost of a police force ought not to fall on the city, burdened as it was with a debt, the interest charge on which each year was about one-half of the entire city revenue. But when it was proposed to have the president appoint a captain and fifteen men to constitute a guard, then Senator John J. Crittenden of

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 24, 1841. Mr. Fendall had only a few weeks before been appointed by President Tyler, succeeding Francis Scott Key.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, p. 571, June 2, 1842.

[3] 27th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 836, May 30, 1842.

Kentucky, who had refused to remain in the Tyler cabinet after the bank veto, felt apprehensive that the president might turn it into a political guard. Recalling the Roman imperial guard, he feared the little band provided for in the pending measure might grow and overshadow the liberties of the people.

After what had already been done by the president, no doubt the Whig majority felt there might be real peril in intrusting him with the proposed authority. It may be concluded that if it had not been for the political rupture between the president and the Whig party, the appointment of the captain of the auxiliary guard would have been intrusted to the president, as was done in 1862, when the Metropolitan police force was created by congress, rather than to the mayor of the city.

In establishing a night police force congress adopted the same general policy as in the case of fire protection. Engines and engine-houses were provided in the vicinity of the public buildings by expenditures from the public treasury, and then turned over to citizens to manage and maintain. In the case of the police, congress provided for its pay, while the city furnished the station houses and the light and heat. The mayor appointed the captain of the guard, the latter selected the members of the force, while the regulations were drawn up by a commission consisting of the mayor, the district attorney and the corporation counsel. In the course of ten days after the passage of the law of Aug. 23, 1842, the mayor selected John H. Goddard as captain,[1] and the latter had chosen fifteen men.[2] Nearly a decade passed before a police was provided to do duty in the day. The slight police protection found necessary in the first forty years of the municipality was due to general as well as local circumstances. On the one hand, the city was free from the great influx of foreign immigration which was such a disturbing element in the larger centres during the thirties and forties. Owing to the lack of manufactures and trade, the population was more homogeneous than was the case in the average American city. There was another modifying influence. For the greater portion of the year Washington had the characteristics of a country town. But when congress was in session, a great change was wrought.

---

[1] Mr. Goddard was in the grocery business at the time and was also a member of the board of aldermen.

[2] The same, Sept. 3, 1842. There is no record that a uniform was worn in the early years. The ordinance of Jan. 7, 1858, directed that the members of the force wear a uniform consisting of a blue frock-coat with standing collar, blue pantaloons with a white stripe one inch wide down each side, a cloth cap with the number of the officer and a metallic badge. The only weapon was a hickory stick or sponton with a spear-formed iron head, which was continued in use nearly two decades, when the billy was substituted. *The Star*, Jan. 3, 1859.

Then throngs of people came to the city, drawn there by business or mere curiosity or by the opportunities offered to the idle and also to the vicious. The files of the local newspapers reflect this change in the community life. Then, and, for the most part, the only time in the year, accounts were found in the newspaper columns of such happenings as robberies or attempted ones in boarding-houses and hotels, and the picking of pockets in the galleries of the capitol. The poor-house and the infirmary and the penitentiary began to fill up.

As soon as the session ended, the bustling throngs on Pennsylvania Avenue disappeared, and that thoroughfare had such a desolate appearance as to suggest to one observer the historical parallel of Jerusalem the day after it was sacked by Titus.[1] However, "the whirl of congressional excitement and strife" having ended, he found in the quiet homes of the residents the pleasant hospitality of a refined society. In his opinion the most agreeable phase of Washington society began with the departure, not the arrival, of congress. This characteristic of the city was noted three years earlier by a writer in the *Boston Atlas,* who found a great relief "to be free from the political turmoil and the round of balls, routs, parties, the eternal excitement and unvarying dissipation which a session brings." Then, he adds, there is "an opportunity to enjoy the society of Washington, the time for the morning call and the enjoyment of the cordial hospitality which distinguishes the leading citizens of Washington" — a society of charm and elegance "not to be found in the wealthiest and most cultivated cities of the Union."[1] At that time the summer afternoons, twice a week, were made the occasion of gatherings on the western terrace of the capitol to listen to concerts by the Marine Band.[2] After the government offices closed for the day at three o'clock Pennsylvania Avenue became a gay promenade, a sort of out-of-door social affair with constantly changing groups, as acquaintances greeted each other and then joined others. The stroll was followed by the sociable cup of tea at the various hospitable homes.

---

[1] Wash. Corres. N. Y. Spirit of the Times. Quoted in the *Intelligencer*, Sept. 23, 1842.

This custom so characteristic of a community life, simple in its forms and where social distinctions were practically unknown, was continued down to the war period[3] in spite of the increase in the population and the approaching climax of the bitterness of the slavery contest that affected every relation of life. The rate of growth of the population of about 500 each year, that had been maintained up to 1840, changed the next decade to a yearly average of more than 1600.[4] The rowdyism of gangs of men and boys became more of a menace as the city grew. In the days of a smaller and scattered population, when a gang came from English Hill, that lay to the east of the city hall, or from Frogtown, south of the capitol, near E Street, or from Navy-yard Hill, or from the Northern Liberties, the general section north of G Street between 12th and 6th streets, or from the Island, as the portion of the city south and west of the Washington Canal came to be called,[1] but few were disturbed and the property loss was trifling. Even when the Washington boys had a stone fight with the Georgetown boys in the vicinity of the bridges over Rock Creek,[2] the entire town was not thrown into an uproar, and property and life placed in peril, as would have been the case if the boys had chosen to settle their differences in the most frequented streets of the city. But when gang rivalries and gang mischief became the controlling spirit of the fire companies, then the entire community was disturbed. For before the decade of 1840 a change had begun in the personnel of the fire companies, so that it was not long before boys had taken the place largely of mature, substantial citizens.[3] The aid of legislation was sought. Two laws were obtained from congress. While an attempt was made by these measures to provide some supervision and control, by creating an organization composed of representatives from each company, yet the main purpose was to bring a more substantial class of men into the service. To this end what was in that period looked on as a valuable privilege, exemption from militia duty, was given to every member of a company. Besides a charter was granted for a fire insurance company. Only members of the city fire companies could hold stock, and in addition they were entitled to insurance eight per cent less than current rates.[4] Hardly had this law been enacted when the militia system fell into disuse and thus the privilege became worthless. In the course of a few years the stock of the insurance company was in the hands of a few men who were no longer efficient as firemen.[1] The state of the fire companies did not improve. The engine-houses were centres of gang mischief and disorder. It was considered great sport to go to the vicinity of a church Sunday evening and raise an alarm of fire for the satisfaction of watching the startled congregation rush from the building. Sometimes fires were actually started in order to enjoy the excitement of a run with the engine.[2] When the fire was real and the aid of the companies sorely needed, the property holder suffered because the members on the way to the fire might take a fancy to fight each other rather than the fire. The extent to which engine-house rivalries and enmities broke out into street fights may be inferred by the action of several of the companies in deciding not to venture out of their own districts.[3] At times these street encounters reached the proportions of a mob riot, as the contending forces surged along Pennsylvania Avenue, in the most central part, or in front of the White House, swearing and shouting, while stones and missiles filled the air.[4] "It is now as certain as the coming of Saturday night," observes the writer of a newspaper communication, "that the fire-bells ring out, and the gangs of boys who have taken charge of the respective engines of the city are all on the *qui vive* to run roaring and swearing through the streets. . . . Who is to be burnt up next Saturday night no one knows, only some one must furnish the required food for excitement of undisciplined boys." [5] While a committee of the city council declared the volunteer system a failure, and the council was asked to establish a paid fire department, yet beyond forbidding persons under twenty-one years of age to assist in hauling fire-engines [6] nothing was done in the way of regulating the companies. This was not because of lack of authority, for the city council adopted a most drastic course following the Northern Liberties Market riot, when it ordered the fire company located there to disband.[1] Congress did nothing, but largely because the fire companies were a power in local politics, although petitioned as early as 1852 to coöperate with the city in establishing a paid fire department to be supported by federal and city contributions. Such a course would have improved the service as well as given recognition and certainty to what was already the existing method of meeting the cost. For some ten years prior to 1828, at which time an engine and building for the Franklin Co. was provided by congress, the Union and the Columbia had been equipped in the same way.[2] Three of the six companies used government property, and what the companies did not supply for maintenance the city council provided.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 22, 1839.

[2] The same, June 1, 1838. The first mention of these events that became annual. Three years later one of the weekly concerts was given on the grounds south of the White House. *Intelligencer*, July 34, 1841.

[3] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 3, p. 307. An account of the afternoon Pennsylvania Avenue promenade as witnessed in 1858. Gail Hamilton's Life in Letters, p. 186.

[4] In 1840 Washington's population was 23,364, and in 1850, 40,001, an increase of 16,637, so that the city's growth not only made up for the loss in 1846 in the District population figures by the retrocession of Alexandria County, but as many more. The population of the entire district in 1840 was 43,712, and in 1850, 51,687.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 11 and 25, 1837, and May 22, 1840. Some other localities were Negro Hill, the northern part of 10th Street (*The Star*, Aug. 3, 1855), Swampoodle in the vicinity of North Capitol Street (*The Star*, Oct. 2, 1855, and Nov. 4, 1859), Crow Hill, 6th Street south of N Street (*The Star*, Aug. 6, 1859), Foggy Bottom, in the vicinity of the south end of New Hampshire Avenue (*The Star*, Aug. 1, 1859), Chicken Cock Hill, north of the capitol (*The Star*, May 21, 1855).

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 15, 1854.

[3] The same, April 21, 1845.

[4] Stats., 9, 607 and 679, March 2 and 3, 1837. This was the Firemen's Insurance Co. of Washington and Georgetown, the second fire insurance company, the first being the Potomac of Georgetown (U. S. Laws, March 2, 1831), chartered by congress since the creation of the Franklin Insurance Co. in 1818. Eighteen years later congress created another company, the Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of the District. Then in 1857 the Washington Insurance Co. was incorporated.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 22, 1850.

[2] The same, Sept. 4, 1840, and Feb. 14, 1842.

[3] The same, Nov. 9, 1849, and Aug. 17, 1849.

[4] The same, Sept. 30, 1844, and March 18, 1852.

[5] The same, March 20, 1850.

[6] Ordinance, Dec. 3, 1852.

More than twenty years after the first movement to reform the city fire service, it was described "as prolific of street fights, rowdyism and crime."[3] In addition to the influence upon national politics of the rupture in the relations of Tyler and the Whig party, conditions in the city of Washington were largely affected. For, as has been stated, the provision made for a night police force was the direct outcome of the Tyler apostasy, as his critics were fond of describing it. More distinctive than had been customary, following a political change in the national administration, was the effect on the newspapers. For while the *Globe* ceased to be the government organ, as was expected when the Whig victory was made known the previous fall, and also lost, as a further logical result of the election, the printing of both houses of congress and of the departments, yet the *Intelligencer*, as the long-time organ of the victorious party, had to share with the *Madisonian* what in the usage of the day was its legitimate part of the party spoils. For the *Madisonian* had broken with the Van Buren wing of the Democratic party and had gone over to the Whigs. So it became a rival of the *Intelligencer* for a share of the party spoils. Its publisher was elected printer of the senate, while the choice of the house fell on the *Intelligencer*. But when, after the death of Harrison, the *Madisonian* stood for Tyler, when other Whig journals forsook him, then that paper was made the organ of the administration, and shortly afterward blossomed forth into a daily.[1] The *Globe*, thus stripped of its position and its patronage, continued to publish the debates and proceedings of congress in the *Congressional Globe*. How long it would have been able to do so if the administration had remained Whig in politics can only be conjectured. For it must be borne in mind that the reporting and printing of the debates of congress had never been and was not at that time a part of the public printing. It was purely a private undertaking. Congress was only one of the subscribers to the *Congressional Globe*, although of course the largest.

---

[1] City council resolution, April 1, 1858. *The Star*, Oct. 1, 1858.

[2] Stats., 3, 525, March 3, 1819, and Stats., 4, 266, May 2, 1828. The Navy Yard Fire Co., which was organized in 1818 (*Intelligencer*, Dec. 12), apparently provided its own building and apparatus for more than twenty years, when congress furnished an engine. (Stats., 5, 348, March 3, 1839.)

[3] *The Star*, Oct. 13, 1859.

The factional differences in the Democratic party were strong enough, even in defeat, not to rest content with the havoc wrought in the business prospects of the *Globe*. A new paper was started to represent the South Carolina or Calhoun section. So the *Spectator* began its career as a weekly, edited by J. L. Martin and J. Heart.[2]

Then party advantage dictated another change that affected the newspapers. A clause in an appropriation bill changed the practice that had been followed since 1819. Instead of the laws being published in newspapers in the different states and territories, it was directed that they should appear in not less than two or more than four of the principal papers published in Washington, the preference to be given to those having the greatest number of permanent subscribers and the most extensive circulation.[3] Soon after the Democrats came in by the election of Polk, in 1844, congress directed a return to the former practice.[1] In the course of two years after the Calhoun organ was started, that statesman had come from his temporary retirement from public office and was a member of the Tyler cabinet as secretary of state. By the fall of 1844, some seven months later, the name of his Washington organ was changed to the *Constitution,* and it appeared twice a week instead of once.[2] Mr. Calhoun had not been at the head of the state department more than a month when J. L. Martin, one of the editors of the *Constitution,* was appointed secretary of legation at Paris, and a little later became chargé d'affaires. His place on the paper was taken by William A. Harris of Virginia.

---

[1] About a month before that change was made, the interest in the paper of Thomas Allen, its founder, was purchased by John B. Jones. *Madisonian*, Nov. 6, 1841.

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 14, 1842.

[3] Stats., 5, 527, Aug. 26, 1842.

As the *Intelligencer* did not join with the majority of the Whig party in opposing the course of Daniel Webster in retaining the portfolio of the department of state in the Tyler cabinet, after all the Whig members resigned, it was felt, no doubt, that the Whig party needed another organ at the Nation's capital. So the *True Whig* appeared as a weekly, and in the course of a year daily issues were begun. Although it was entirely dependent on the usual revenues of a newspaper, in addition to what money its supporters were willing to supply, yet it continued for over two years.[3] Some three months after the *True Whig* began its career, an early indication of the rising tide of sentiment that made Henry Clay for the third time and, as it proved, the last, a presidential candidate, is to be found in the establishment of the *Independent,* a semi-weekly paper advocating the nomination of Henry Clay more than two years before the convention was to assemble. The paper had but a brief existence.[4] It was probably soon after the *Independent* came to an end that Horace Greeley, then nursing into vigorous life the *New York Tribune*, that he had founded a little more than a year before, announced that the *Tribune* was "delivered early each morning" to subscribers at the national capital for 50 cents a month.[1] In his positive fashion Greeley was not only advocating Whig doctrines, but Henry Clay as their great exponent. But the *Tribune*, even wearing the Clay badge, did not evidently, in the opinion of John T. Towers, who was the proprietor of a book and job printing office, meet the needs of the hour in Washington. Then again, the *True Whig* had been dead some seven months. In order, as he stated, that the principles of the Whig party, as laid down by Henry Clay, might be duly expounded, he began the publication of the *Whig Standard*, a two-cent daily evening paper.[2] The Clay organ, the *Independent*, survived long enough to be included in the list of Washington newspapers placed in the corner-stone of St. Paul's English Lutheran Church, a little more than a year later.[3] As this list, comprising the *Intelligencer*, the *Globe*, the *Madisonian*, the *Whig Standard*, the *Spectator* and *National Zeitung*, shows, up to within four months of the election of the Democratic presidential ticket, headed by Polk, except an interval of some seven months, four dailies were published equally divided between the two parties, while the two weeklies were Democratic. A copy of the *Army and Navy Chronicle* might have been included, as it had then made one of the occasional appearances which it had fallen into the habit of doing since 1841, and which proved to be final.[4] The purpose of the church people was evidently not to preserve a complete set of the newspapers published in the District, otherwise the *Georgetown Advocate*, a tri-weekly, would have been included. It had then been in existence for five years, and continued to appear until 1853, when it was succeeded by the *Independent*.[5] A good many of the residents of German descent were interested in the St. Paul Lutheran Church enterprise, and therefore it seems specially appropriate that in the number of local newspapers sealed up in the corner-stone should be included a copy of the *National Zeitung*, a weekly, the first newspaper in the German language printed in the District. It came from the office of P. A. Sage and Co., who had then issued the eighth number of a literary German monthly known as the *German in America*, which the publishers asserted was "the largest paper in the Union" and had the largest circulation of any German paper in the country.[1] In a little more than three years the contents of the office of the *Zeitung* at 7th Street and Louisiana Avenue were advertised to be sold at auction.[2] In the fall of 1846, a few months after the career of this first German paper came to a close, a procession of two or three hundred members of the German Benevolent Society, headed by the German Band, passed through the streets to the new hall, just erected by the society on the west side of 11th Street, a short distance north of F Street, where they attended the exercises of dedication.[3] In addition to these evidences of an increase in the German element in the population at that period, it will also be recalled that besides St. Paul's English Lutheran Church, which was just starting, the Concordia Lutheran Church and St. Mary's Catholic Church were in existence.[4] The influence of the growth of the population at the beginning of the decade of 1840 may be traced in the expansion of the principal section of the city which had Pennsylvania Avenue between the capitol and the president's house as the main thoroughfare. As early as 1837, the section north of G Street and east of 12th, that came to be known as the Northern Liberties, a term presumably borrowed from Philadelphia, began to develop,[1] while about the same time the locality to the south between the city canal and the Potomac, then beginning to be known as the Island, was attracting attention as a population centre.[2] The Island, or South Washington, did not develop as rapidly as the Northern Liberties. Both localities secured authority to establish fire companies,[3] yet the efforts of the citizens of the Northern Liberties alone had permanent results, as an engine-house was built on Mount Vernon Square, at 8th and K streets.[4] Six years after the citizens provided fire protection for their section, the city erected a market on the same public space, but at 7th and K streets.[5] The course of building at this general period had long since passed K Street, the northern limit of the survey of the city completed many years before by the general government. At this time, as the result of the expenditure of federal and city funds, the grades of the streets between K and O streets and 3d and 12th streets were established.[6] The centre of population of the city was discussed when it was proposed in 1839 by Dr. James S. Gunnell, then appointed by President Van Buren, in place of Dr. William Jones, postmaster of the city, to remove the post-office from the Masonic Hall building, at the southwest corner of Louisiana Avenue and John Marshall Place, where it had

---

[1] Stats., 9, 76, Aug. 8, 1846.

[2] Journalism in the United States, p. 253. In the library of congress the files of the paper are *Spectator*, July 2, 1842–Oct. 4, 1844; *Constitution*, Oct. 12, 1844–1845.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 17, 1841, June 11, 1842, and Feb. 8, 1843.

[4] The same, March 2, 1842. Journalism in the United States, p. 240.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 29, 1842. The price of the *Tribune* at that time in New York was 1½ cents a copy.

[2] The same, Sept. 13 and Nov. 7, 1843.

[3] The same, June 21, 1844.

[4] The same, Aug. 18, 1841, and Nov. 13, 1844.

[5] The same, July 6 and Aug. 3, 1853. Settle and Rodier, publishers.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 7 and May 5, 1843.

[2] The same, July 1, 1846.

[3] The same, Oct. 14, 1846.

[4] Besides the newspapers mentioned as appearing in the early forties are the following as referred to in the *Intelligencer: Citizens' Compiler*, weekly, temperance, Legran I. Lerchett, publisher. *The Capital* (*Intelligencer*, April 27, 1843), Democratic capital daily, May 9, 1843–Feb. 5 and 28, 1844. Library of Congress.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 25, 1837. In a report of the committee of ways and means to the common council, May 26, 1845 (in Laws, 1845) it is stated, "It is a well-known fact that in the five years between 1839 and 1844 there was a much larger increase in the aggregate value of property by the construction of new buildings and in the appreciation of lots, especially in the northern portion of the second and third wards [between 1st and 15th streets northwest] than in any other five-year period since 1824." The same, Oct. 19, 1840.

[3] Ordinance, May 29 and Nov. 5, 1840.

[4] *The Star*, Oct. 1, 1858. History of the fire company. In 1855 the city erected a building on the public space bounded by New York Avenue, L, 5th and 6th streets, which was occupied both by the fire company and by a public school.

[5] Ordinance, March 11, 1846.

[6] Message of the mayor, July 19, 1841. In Laws, 1841. The work was done under the direction of Lieutenant A. A. Humphreys, corps of topographical engineers, detailed by the president. His assistants were paid by the city. (Ordinance, May 26, 1841.) Two years later the work was advanced as far west as 19th Street and north to P Street. Mayor's message. In Laws, 1843.

been for two years, to the vicinity of the President's Square. On behalf of the new location it was said that all the department buildings except the patent office are in the west end of the city, and there also the heads of the departments and most of the foreign ministers reside. On the other hand, it was asserted that nine-tenths of the three hundred members of congress live near to or east of the present post-office location.[1] As it turned out, the extreme western site was not chosen, as the post-office in June 29, 1839, was removed to the hotel building at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 12th Street northwest. When Tyler succeeded Harrison, and the Democrat, Dr. Jones, was again postmaster, he removed the office on Sept. 30, 1841, to Carusi's saloon, C and 11th streets, and two years later to the two-story brick buildings on the west side of 7th Street between E and F streets, which were torn down in 1857 to make room for the extension of the post-office department building.[2] The development of the city can also be traced in the establishment and location of churches. During the two decades preceding the civil war, of the twenty-three church buildings erected, twelve were located in the section north of Pennsylvania Avenue, from 15th Street to the capitol, while seven were on the Island, two on Capitol Hill and two west of 17th Street.[3]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 22, 1839.

[2] History of city post-office. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 6.

[3] The church buildings erected in the central section and the dates were: St. Paul's English Lutheran, 1843; Epiphany Episcopal, 1843; Ascension Episcopal, 1844; McKendree Methodist Episcopal, 1845; Central Presbyterian, 1845; St. Mary's German Catholic, 1846; E Street Baptist, 1846; Trinity Episcopal, 1850; Trinity German Evangelical Lutheran, 1851; Assembly Presbyterian, 1852; Fletcher Chapel Methodist Episcopal, 1853; St. Aloysius Catholic, 1859.

Island or South Washington: Ryland Chapel Methodist Episcopal, 1844; Grace Episcopal, 1851; St. John's German Evangelical Lutheran, 1853; Sixth Street Presbyterian, 1853; Westminster Presbyterian, 1853; St. Dominic Catholic, 1856; Fifth Baptist, 1857.

Western section: Union Methodist Episcopal, 1846; Western Presbyterian, 1854.

Capitol Hill, New Jerusalem Swedenborgian, 1847; Waugh Chapel Methodist Episcopal, 1854.

Some two years after the citizens of the Island had secured authority from the city council to provide, at their own expense, a fire company station, which they did not make use of, they realized that as parts of two of the most populous wards they had no effective voice in the city councils. "For more than forty years," the resolutions adopted at a public meeting declared, "the property of this section has been subjected to taxation, but has participated to only a limited degree in the benefits of street improvements. It is discovered that the common fund will only be expended where the greatest influence in the council can be brought to bear. Our streets are unopened and are likely to remain so, although houses are being built."[1] By the common fund was meant what remained from the taxes levied in each ward upon the real and personal property in that ward, after deducting the ward's share in the payment of salaries of city officers, for the care of the poor, the interest on the funded debt and other general city expenses. Other than the ward contributions, the receipts from licenses were the only source of the fund to meet the general expenses of the city.

The South Washington citizens had two grievances. There was the discrimination practised by the more populous section of the ward against the more sparsely settled, in the distribution of the money devoted to street improvements. But the root of the evil, they declared, was the system which was established by the ordinance of 1812 and made a part of the organic law by the charter of 1820. While the city council alone had the power to distribute street improvement money, yet it was subject to the restriction that the funds of each ward should only be appropriated to improvements within that ward. There was no such thing as general street improvements, only ward street improvements, and then only such as the revenue of each ward permitted.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 13, 1842. Protest signed by W. A. Bradley, chairman, and Wm. Lloyd, secretary. Two years later citizens in the same section declared that their streets had never received even the slight public improvement of that day in being graded and gravelled. The same, Feb. 23, 1844.

In spite of the narrow policy that treated the city, not as a unit, but as a collection of neighborhoods, it was common in the towns of the day, and traces of it are still to be found. It was so strongly intrenched in Washington that it lasted as long as the mayoralty government. Although eight years before the government was changed the city council directed that congress be asked to repeal "all portions of the charter as relate to said funds."[1]

To remedy the defects of the existing system, the protesting citizens of South Washington favored either making their section a separate ward or raising by general taxation only so much as may be necessary to defray the expenses of the corporation. Then, following the practice of American cities of that day, to levy a special tax on the property along each street or section of street to meet the cost of the improvements which the property owners may ask to be made. The protest went unheeded, unless it may be considered that it lay at the bottom of the charter provision which a joint city council committee recommended two years later,[2] and which proposed to establish the wardless system of using the public money for needed improvements in any part of the city. This grave defect in city management was emphasized later on in an annual message of the mayor, when he stated that in the case of the three eastern wards, their income was almost wholly absorbed by their share in the interest in the city debt and their quotas to the general expenses of the city government, leaving scarcely anything for street improvements.[3] On the other hand, the three western wards, where three-fourths of the population lived, and where nine-tenths of the assessed value of city property was found,[4] were dissatisfied because they had only the same representation as the eastern wards in the city council. The local antagonisms growing out of such conditions were of greater moment when the consideration of changes in the charter were taken up than the exclusion of the propertyless class from any voice in city affairs. For there was practically no difference of opinion when it was proposed to extend the suffrage by the abolition of the property qualification for voters. This situation became at once apparent when the city council, in 1844, four years after the flurry caused by the political use of the charter amendment issue in congress, provided for the holding of a delegated convention to consider the subject. No objection was made to the provision that the delegates were to be the choice, not of the citizens who owned property and who at that time were alone entitled to vote at municipal elections, but of all white male citizens who had lived in the city a year. Serious objection was made to the basis of representation in the convention, which was that of ward population. Two of the eastern wards declined on that ground to send delegates, and the third ward in that section was only partially represented.[1] While the convention went on and prepared a charter, and submitted it to congress, yet that body did not act. In fact, it was not until four years later when a charter was brought to congress, approved at a special election by a manhood vote of three to one, that congress finally acted.[2] During these four years efforts were made to allay and adjust the dissatisfaction growing out of the inequality between the eastern and western sections of the city, between the populous and thinly settled wards. Two measures especially designed for this end were passed by the city council. The ward debts were transferred to the general or funded debt, and a general readjustment of ward lines was provided, so that there would be seven instead of six wards. The wandering course of the new ward lines instead of the old division into oblong blocks was devised, not so

---

[1] Resolution, Jan. 7, 1863. The retarding influence of the ward system in the development of the city is the subject of frequent comment in the Sessford Annals, Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 9, 1844.

[3] In Laws, 1844.

[4] *Intelligencer*, March 16, 1854.

[1] 28th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 236, April 17, 1844. Account of how the convention was constituted and the copy of the charter adopted.

[2] The text of the charter approved by the people is found in the issue of the *Intelligencer* of Feb. 7, 1848. Also report of the city charter vote in house report No. 73, 30th Cong., 1st Sess., April 26, 1848.

much to equalize the population, as the charter required,[1] as "to attach to the more populous wards the large tracts of vacant territory and reducing as much as possible the area of the more sparsely settled wards." [2] The shifting of the burden of debt from the wards to the entire city, although in flat contradiction to the current theory and practice in expending the public funds, was justified by the city council on the ground that the debt had been incurred by the action of the whole city through ordinances enacted by the council, and therefore the whole was bound for their payment.[3] While recognizing that the entire city through its representatives in the council authorized the expenditure of public money for improvements, yet in practice they merely distributed ward funds. No change was made in the existing system. The taxpayers of populous wards, no doubt, felt a keen satisfaction that their contributions to the tax fund were spent in the vicinity of their homes. As to those who lived in other parts of the city it was no concern of theirs that they had no street improvements.

The changes made in the relations of the wards, while largely palliative, had the effect of lessening dissatisfaction with the local government. For this reason, in the later period of the charter agitation, there was a shifting of issues. Then ward inequalities did not arouse as great an interest as the question of the extent of franchise limitations. For it was felt that while other than property owners might be allowed to vote, yet only those who had a substantial stake in the community should be intrusted with the duty of making and executing the laws. In fact, at that period, manhood suffrage for voters was radical only in the practice at Washington, not in theory. As to the members of the city council and the city officers, it was the belief that real estate ownership was a necessary qualification. When the charter came to congress, manhood suffrage was provided for voters, while a property qualification was required of those elected to office. No objection was made in congress to this restriction.[1] However, some of the members thought the voters' franchise was not liberal enough, as it was said the requirement of the payment of a school tax of $1, and personal taxes, when any had been assessed, constituted a property qualification.[2] The new charter, therefore, granted manhood suffrage with these restrictions, while freeholders continued to be the only class from which the mayor, members of the city council and elective officers, including the newly created board of assessors, could be drawn. This latter limitation was not removed until 1868, a year after negro suffrage was established, and within three years of the abolition of the mayoralty form of government.

---

[1] Ordinances, Feb. 16 and April 22, 1846. No further change was made in the wards although the councils had the power to redistrict the city at any time.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 30, 1846. Report of committee of board of aldermen defending the measure which was passed over the mayor's veto.

[3] The same. This was the second time it had been done, as by ordinance of July 11, 1818, the debt of the city was funded and the ward debts were included, making a total of $60,000. (*Intelligencer*, May 30, 1845. History of city debt in report of common council committee.)

The charter of 1848 also broadened the taxing power of the corporation, so that real estate did not continue to bear nine-tenths of the burden of taxation.[3] For the first time the city was given the power to tax intangible property, stocks and all kinds of income-yielding securities, whether owned by individuals or companies.[4] In place of a flat license rate for storekeepers, the tax was levied on the amount of the capital invested.[5] Private bankers, brokers and money-lenders were taxed on the capital employed. The revenue of the city was increased, yet current expenditures absorbed it, so that no decrease was made in the tax on real estate. From that source came more than one-half of the total revenue.[1] The sinking fund, which was abolished in 1837, was revived by the ordinance of May 28, 1847. But this provision for debt payment had to give way, as was the case in the first period of the fund from 1818 to 1837, to the demands of current needs, and so its operation left but slight impression on the debt as a whole.[2] By the assumption of the ward debts, aggregating about $100,000, the funded debt was increased to $831,000.[3] This then was the state of the debt, when the charter of 1848, as adopted by the city council, approved by a vote of the people and enacted by congress, not only forbade an increase in the funded debt unless favored by two-thirds of the legal voters, but directed an annual reduction of not less than $10,000. The only proposition of debt increase submitted to a vote was made ten years later. It failed to secure the necessary approval, but, nevertheless, the money used in making the Potomac water-supply available for the citizens was borrowed, and the indebtedness was carried as water stock.[4] On the other hand, the debt-reduction rate was not maintained, so that twelve years later the total had not fallen below $793,000, while a floating debt of $160,000 was outstanding, an increase of $47,000 in fifteen years.[5] The change in the franchise requirements doubled the number of voters, but at the outset, apparently, had no other effect. No change was made in the city officials at the first election after the charter was in force, although for the first time the three principal offices after the mayor were made elective, as was the case with the board of assessors. W. W. Seaton was reëlected mayor, although the Whig party was divided, as Peter Force was a candidate. At the head of the Democratic ticket was John Boyle.[1]

---

[1] Eight years later when congress amended the charter of Georgetown the franchise conditions were made similar to those in Washington. Stats., 11, 32, Aug. 11, 1856.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, p. 766, May 15, 1848. This was also the view of some citizens. *Intelligencer*, March 11, 1844.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 23, 1848.

[4] Mayor's message. In Laws, 1845. Personal taxes were done away with in 1872 by the territorial assembly. They were restored in 1875 by congress.

[5] Ordinance, Oct. 3, 1848.

---

[1] Up to the year 1860 the rate continued at 75 cents, the maximum named in the charter except for three years, when it was 60, 65 and 45 cents respectively.

[2] The sources of the debt are given in a report to the common council. (*Intelligencer*, May 30, 1845; also in Laws, 1845.) At that time the funded debt was $740,243 or $22 per capita, and was chargeable to the city lottery, the interest on the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal loan and the Washington Canal, with the exception of $113,000. The latter, therefore, represents the entire indebtedness other than ward debts for city maintenance accumulated in forty-three years.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 28, 1846.

[4] City council resolution, May 6, 1858.

[5] *Intelligencer*, April 3, 1860. Message of the mayor.

---

[1] The vote for mayor stood: Seaton 1628, Force 424 and Boyle 813. Total 2865. (*Intelligencer*, June 5, 1848.) At the previous mayoralty election, when only property holders voted, 1465 votes were cast. (*Intelligencer*, June 3, 1846.) The appointive holders of the offices of collector and surveyor received the approval of a popular vote, but the register, who had also up to that time been an appointive officer, was defeated. The estimated population of the city in 1845 was 33,774, and in 1848, 35,532. (Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, pp. 329 and 337.)

CHAPTER XI

THE CITIZENS AND THE TAXPAYERS

THE annual interest charge on the city debt, the burden of the Washington Canal and the expanding needs of a growing population as the years went on, kept the city budget abreast of its income. The city revenues were expressed in larger figures each year, but there was no lessening of the taxes. To the principal taxpayer, the owner of real estate, the broadening of the taxing power by the extension of the chartered rights in 1848 brought no relief. In fact, the contributions of citizens to the city treasury were increased, and this was not done without arousing protest. The local authorities were warned that taxes must be kept low if the city was to fulfil its mission in becoming, not a great importing centre like New York, or a great distributing centre like Philadelphia or a manufacturing place like Pittsburgh, but merely a pleasant place to live in. In this particular, it was asserted, Washington may be made the equal of any town in the United States.[1] Under existing conditions, if a majority of property owners wanted a brick sidewalk laid, or a street paved, a special tax was imposed to defray the cost. This method of securing sidewalks was adopted in the early years of the city, and was quite generally made use of. More than a quarter of a century passed before a similar provision was made by the city authorities for the paving of streets.[2] Then a section of 7th Street between H Street north and Virginia Avenue was paved with cobble, or, as it was described at that time, a pebble pavement was laid, the first in the city.[3] Seven years passed before further paving was done, and then the surface of the roadway on the north side of Market Space between 7th and 9th streets was paved with cobble, the method generally followed in cities in this country at that period.[1] Up to 1860 only five additional street sections were thus improved.[2] No doubt the cost of paving roadways of such unusual width accounts largely for the comparatively limited amount done. In addition, it should be borne in mind the citizens of Washington had limited resources compared with those in towns where trade flourished, so that not only the present means were lacking, but also the incentives due to the hopes for future trade expansion. Both of these latter factors were to be found in towns of that period, where also the same special tax system prevailed, but where public improvements, less costly because of narrower streets, were in larger volume than in the Nation's capital.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 29, 1849.

[2] Ordinance, April 23, 1845.

[3] As may be concluded, this distinction was due to the fact that 7th Street was the principal business street. *Intelligencer*, June 2, 1845.

Congress, too, rather balked at the cost. For nearly a decade and a half after providing a macadam pavement, on Pennsylvania Avenue between the capitol and the president's house, without, however, provision for its maintenance, nothing more was done. Its condition became so intolerable[3] that during the season of 1845, at the time the city authorities put down the first cobblestone pavement, a similar improvement was made by congress on Pennsylvania Avenue to replace the macadam surface.[4] Again, as when the first pavement was laid, the question was considered as to the most economical method of treating such a broad surface. For the second time the avenue was divided into strips, and by using the cheaper method of gravelling the centre and confining the more expensive cobble paving to the spaces on each side, the total cost was kept down. Two years later, when the stone paving was extended over the centre strip, thus giving a uniform surface from curb to curb, the device was resorted to of having the sidewalks the unusual width for that day of thirty feet.[1] The great width of the avenue had an influence at an early period on property values, so that those on the north side were double those on the south side.[2] The sections of the avenue west of the White House and east of the capitol were, in the year 1845, for the first time improved, as they were included within the range of a congressional appropriation. The surface was gravelled, as was done with the corporation-improved streets, with the addition, however, that sidewalks were laid in the western section.[3] Limited town resources may also be traced in the entire abandonment of street lighting, beginning shortly after 1830. For more than a decade following, the city streets were unlighted. Finally, in 1842, congress appropriated money to erect lamp-posts and provide lamps and oil for the section of Pennsylvania Avenue between the capitol and the White House.[4] "The Great National Broadway of the Metropolis," as it was termed at that time,[5] had, for seven years, the distinction of being the only street in the Nation's capital lighted at night.[6] It is quite evident congress became restive about the street-lighting expense, even when confined to one section of Pennsylvania Avenue, and two years after assuming it, limited the period when the lamps were to be lighted to the sessions of congress.[7] In the meantime the appeal made to congress to charter the Washington Gas Light Co., as early as 1842,[8] was followed, later on, by a memorial from citizens asking that the formation of a company be authorized.[9] In the course of the year 1847 the experiment of James Crutchett, in producing what he called solar gas from oil, which he carried on in a building within the grounds of the capitol,[1] enabled him to light the building and grounds, and also to furnish a light for a lantern at the top of a staff ninety feet above the dome.[2] The new lighting medium promptly secured the patronage of congress.[3] Money was voted to pay Mr. Crutchett for his light, and with this encouragement, and with hopes of the future of public and private business, a blending of interests was effected, and the rights of Mr. Crutchett to his process were transferred to the Washington Gas Light Co.[4] Less than four months later the company was chartered by congress, with a capital of $50,000.[5] At last Washington was to be supplied with a lighting medium which at that time was in use in all of the larger towns. While six years had passed since the first application had been made to congress, and it is evident there were rival interests, yet the backwardness of the capital city in this respect was some years later attributed by officials of the company, not to the inattention of congress or to the struggle for the privilege, but to the belief that it would be impossible to maintain a remunerative business in a place where the population was so scattered.[6] However, such an anticipation was not realized, as the company did a profitable business from the outset, although no doubt the patronage of the government was the important factor. At the session the charter was granted, appropriations were made for equipping the capitol building, and the president's house with gas-pipes, for laying pipes along Pennsylvania Avenue from the capitol to the president's house, and for the cost of lighting. The company sold its stock for 75 cents on the dollar, or $15 a share, the par value of which was $20, and began the erection in 1848 of works at the termination of 10th Street at the canal.[1] Using the government pipe lines, in less than a year the capitol, White House and the avenue were lighted with gas.[2] Six months after the government began to pay gas bills a dividend of 3 per cent on the stock of $50,000 was paid.[3] It is probable this first division of the profits of the business, eighteen months after the company secured a charter, was one of the causes that made necessary a public defence by the company of the rates charged for its product. Its output,[4] so it was explained, was equal to 75,000 feet, and the charge of $8 per thousand feet for oil gas was equivalent, the company claimed, to $8.75 for coal gas at $3.50 per thousand feet. However, while the company maintained it was furnishing a cheaper and better gas than was produced in any town in the country, yet it announced that it had "in contemplation an arrangement by which next winter it will be able to reduce the price of the gas 20 or 25 per cent."

---

[1] Ordinance, Aug. 26, 1852.

[2] F Street between 14th and 15th streets. (Ordinance, April, 1853.) C Street from 4½ to 3d. (Ordinance, July 9, 1855.) D Street between 6th and 7th streets. (Ordinance, March 18, 1857.) 9th Street between Pennsylvania Avenue and F Street. (Ordinance, May 12, 1859.) 7th Street between H and L streets. (Ordinance, July 22, 1859.)

[3] In the vicinity of the National Hotel at 6th Street a lady, in crossing the avenue, incautiously stepped in a puddle and plunged in three feet of mire. *Intelligencer*, Sept. 22, 1845.

[4] 29th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 1, Dec. 2, 1845, p. 392.

---

[1] 30th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 1, p. 658, Dec. 7, 1847.

[2] *Intelligencer*, July 12, 1841.

[3] The same, May 14, 1845.

[4] Stats., 5, 498. *Intelligencer*, Nov. 3, 1842. Announcement of the lighting up of Pennsylvania Avenue.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 1, 1845.

[6] The same, Oct. 24, 1849.

[7] Stats., 5, 691, June 17, 1844. *Intelligencer*, Aug. 19, 1844.

[8] Resolution, city council, May 25, 1842.

[9] 29th Cong., 1st Sess., House, Doc. No. 592, May 4, 1846.

---

[1] 30th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 34, Jan. 16, 1849.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 15, 1847; Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. II, p. 336.

[3] Eight years before the great chandelier in the house fell under the weight of the oil lamps, but fortunately no one was injured. *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 19, 1840.

[4] *Intelligencer*, March 24, 1848.

[5] Stats., 9, 722, July 8, 1848. The first board of directors as named in the bill was John F. Callan, Jacob Bigelow, B. B. French, W. H. Harover, M. C. Callan and W. A. Bradley. The president was John F. Callan and the secretary Jacob Bigelow. *Intelligencer*, July 14, 1848.

[6] *Intelligencer*, March 27, 1856. Address of the gas company to the public.

A few weeks later, when Ignatius Mudd, the commissioner of public buildings, sent his annual report to congress, he expressed the opinion that the government paid too much for gas, "especially as all the pipes were laid at the government expense." He thought it probable other companies would be formed and a reduction come as a result of competition. When another six months rolled around, and the company declared a dividend of five per cent, which was stated to be semi-annual, public opinion as to the justice of the current charge for the service became more pronounced.[5] However, the reduction in the rates suggested as possible, in the company's address to the public, was made and amounted to twenty per cent.[1] A further concession was made to allay public dissatisfaction, as the company decided to make gas from coal instead of oil, which could be sold for $4 instead of $6.40, the then current rate for oil gas.[2] While the necessary changes were being made in the works in the 10th Street locality, the opposition to the company came to a head in the formation of a new concern which at once began the building of a plant on Maine Avenue, between 3d and 4½ streets, and also bordering the canal.[3] Although as yet no charter had been obtained, before the new plant was completed the prospective competitor absorbed the Washington Gas Light Co. by an agreement with the stockholders to buy their holdings.[4] The new management, with Silas H. Hill as president, completed the Maine Avenue works, so that by the beginning of the last month of the year, the city mains were supplied with coal gas from the new centre.[5] The company entered upon a policy of expansion. As the Pennsylvania Avenue pipes were defective, a proposition was made to the government, and accepted, by which the ownership of this line was vested in the company on condition that the old pipes be replaced with new, that the line be extended so as to bring gas to the executive buildings, and that it be furnished to the government at $3.50.[6] To provide for such improvements and extensions, as well as to meet the demand for service from private consumers, congress gave the company authority to increase its stock to $300,000.[1] Although a few months later a semiannual dividend of 3½ per cent was declared,[2] thus maintaining the record of the company as a steady dividend earner, the new issue of stock was only partially taken by citizens, an indication of the slender financial resources of the community. For the most part the stock was placed in Philadelphia.[3] So important were these holdings that for five years three of the five directors were Philadelphia men. Then the outside representation was reduced to two.[4] The first dividend declared in 1852 by the new management was followed, as was the case when the company began to show this evidence of prosperity, by newspaper criticism and complaints. The $4 rate to small consumers was thought to be excessive, while a good deal of stress was laid on the inconvenience to the patrons of the company of being obliged to go to such a remote point as the Maine Avenue location of the company's works to pay their bills.[5] The grievance led to a suggestion of municipal ownership. It was declared that the city ought to own the gas works as well as the water works, when the latter were secured. However, nothing further was heard of this proposition. The company followed a policy of conciliation, and in the course of a few weeks announced that an office had been opened on the second floor of the building at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 8th Street, where bills could be paid at the usual discount of five per cent.[6] The growth of the business was greatly aided by the liberal policy of congress in providing street lighting. In five years after the company was organized the cost of lighting the entire length of Pennsylvania Avenue from Rock Creek to the navy yard was provided for by annual appropriation. This area was enlarged from time to time, so as by 1864 to include the extension of Pennsylvania Avenue along M Street, through Georgetown, and also a section of 32d Street, while 4½, 7th and 12th streets, where they crossed the Mall, as well as Maryland Avenue west and 6th Street south.[1] While the lamps were being put in place in 1853, along Pennsylvania Avenue, the gravel surface from 17th Street to Rock Creek, laid nine years before at federal expense, was replaced by congress with cobble. But the section east of the capitol did not share in this improvement. When the civil war broke out, the cobble pavement on Pennsylvania Avenue extended only from the capitol to Rock Creek.

---

[1] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 339. *Intelligencer*, June 19 and Aug. 6, 1851, Lot 7, Square 382, southeast corner of 10th Street and Louisiana Avenue. *The Star*, March 22, 1859.

[2] 31st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 30, Jan. 24, 1850.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 13, 1849.

[4] The same, Jan. 19, 1850.

[5] The same, July 9, 1850.

---

[1] 31st Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 47, March 3, 1851.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 19, 1851. The number of gas consumers at that time was 200.

[3] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 350, Sessfords Annals.

[4] The same, Aug. 6, 1851. It is evident, from the statement in the issue of Aug. 13 by Ulysses Ward, the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., that the stockholders received in the deal what they had paid in on the stock, namely, $37,500, or $15 per share. Mr. Ward was the second president.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 4, 1851; the same, June 23, 1852. Description of the new plant capable of a daily output of 150,000 cubic feet. Mr. Hill was a lawyer and had just completed a long term as a member of the city council, serving as president of the common council and also of the board of aldermen.

[6] 32d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 79, Feb. 20, 1852. Report of William Easby, commissioner of public buildings.

---

[1] Stats., 10, 734, Aug. 2, 1852. By act of Jan. 3, 1855 (Stats., 10, 835) the authorized issue was brought up to $500,000, and before the close of the year all had been issued with the exception of $76,000. *The Star*, Sept. 28, 1855.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 31, 1852.

[3] The same, April 15, 1853.

[4] *The Star*, Jan. 5, 1858. George W. Riggs, of the banking firm of Corcoran and Riggs, in 1856 succeeded S. H. Hill as president.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 13, 1853.

[6] The same, Jan. 27 and Feb. 2, 1853.

The gas company planned to make use of the authority conferred by the law of 1852, when the capital stock was increased, to extend its lines across Rock Creek into Georgetown.[2] As a preliminary step a gasometer was built on K Street between 21st and 22d streets.[3] In the midst of these active preparations to enter the Georgetown field, a company was formed in that town, in 1853, with the announced purpose of supplying gas at a price not to exceed $3.50, half a dollar less than the Washington rate.[4] This enterprise met with such encouragement that early in the following year the public was informed the works were nearly completed, and street lighting could be done as soon as the lamps were in place.[5] In the meantime an application had been made to congress for a charter for the Georgetown Gas Co., which was granted before the session closed.[6] In thus creating a new company congress did not recognize the value of competition, as a provision was inserted repealing the clause in the former law which gave the Washington Co. the right to enter Georgetown.[1] Nor on the other hand did congress at that time attempt to regulate the price, although informed by the commissioner of public buildings, John B. Blake, that "the government is paying vastly more than is paid elsewhere." The same idea was intended to be conveyed by the writer of a newspaper communication who declared the Washington Co. was an "odious monopoly." [2] But congress, although asked by citizens to do so,[3] did not apply what was evidently regarded, at least locally, as likely to be effective in the protection of the public interests, the remedy of competition, although the right of any person or persons or any incorporated company that might be created by congress to engage in the same business was specifically reserved in the charter. The company itself from time to time reduced the rates.[4] By the company's charter the city government was given no control over the company, except that the right to the use of the streets conferred by that instrument was subject to the regulations the corporation might prescribe, and the buildings erected must also be in accordance with such regulation.

---

[1] Stats., 10, 207; 11, 225 and 378; 13, 347.

[2] *Intelligencer*, April 15, 1853.

[3] The same, July 2, 1853. Five years later a new plant was built at the foot of G Street. *The Star*, Jan. 27, 1859.

[4] The same, Dec. 2, 1853.

[5] *The Star*, Feb. 8, 1854.

[6] Stats., 10, 786, July 20, 1854. The stock was fixed at $150,000 in shares of $25. The first board of directors as named in the charter

However, public regulation was exercised, some twelve years after the company had been incorporated, in two instances; first, when the city council created the office of gas inspector to inspect the metres,[5] and when congress fixed a rate limit.[6]

---

was Robert P. Dodge, Richard Cruikshank, William M. Fitzhugh, Richard Pettit, William F. Seymour, Adolphus H. Pickrell, William Bucknell and David English, the latter being designated as president.

[1] *The Star*, May 15, 1854.

[2] The same, Sept. 28, 1854.

[3] The same, Dec. 8, 1859. Three years before the organization of a gas company on mutual principles was proposed. The same, March 27, 1856.

[4] The price of gas as determined by the company was as follows: 1848, $8; 1850, $6.40; 1852, $4; 1854, $3.80. *The Star*, Nov. 30, 1860.

[5] Ordinance, May 12, 1860.

[6] Six years after the rate had been reduced by the company to $3.80 congress directed, in a clause making the usual appropriation for lighting the public buildings and Pennsylvania Avenue and streets across the Mall, that the company receive no more than $3.50, with a discount

While the service of the company and its charges were criticised, the city authorities were blamed, because the street lighting, paid for from the city funds, was inadequate. Four years after the gas company began business, the city council, apparently aiming to improve the city lighting, made use of an expedient, not uncommon in municipalities of that period, of providing lamps and lighting them on any street where a majority of the property holders desired such an improvement, the cost to be assessed against the property.[1] It is quite evident the property holders either failed to respond or objected to such an arrangement, just as was the case with sidewalk and paving work, as the following year street lighting was made a ward expense, and that was the method followed for seven years. Then by ordinance of Jan. 1, 1860, the cost was equally divided between the property holders and the wards, but only when the consent of a majority of the property owners which limited the work done was secured.[2] There was another cause of dissatisfaction. The practice of making no provision to have the street lamps lighted when the moon was expected to shine was declared to be absurd. But of course the city made use of the moon to save money, and for the same reason the lights were turned out at midnight. When, however, an arrangement could be made with the gas company to keep the lamps going until 4 A.M. without increasing the rate, that was done.[3] A few years later, and just on the eve of the civil war, a change back to the old schedule was only agreed to by the city council because of lack of money, as an all-night service was favored.[4] The tax charges against the citizens of Washington at this period were not limited to the payment of the real and personal tax, the license on business, special assessments for sidewalks, pavements and street lamps. For

---

of 10 per cent for prompt payment. (Stats., 12, 107, June 25, 1860.) The next congress reduced the rate to $2.80 to the government and $3.00 to other customers. (Stats., 12, 534, July 11, 1862.)

[1] Ordinance, June 5, 1852.

[2] Journal, 68th Council, p. 34, June 24, 1868.

[3] *The Star*, Jan. 12, 1857.

[4] The same, Jan. 22, 1861.

garbage removal, a charge of one cent a bucket was made. When the snow fell, each householder was required to have it removed from the sidewalk in front of his property within six hours or incur a penalty of fifty cents per hour, providing the property was not outside the bounds of a district fixed by order of the mayor of 1847, and including the most populous section, which was, however, but a small part of the city's area.[1] As outlined by the mayor, the portion of the city where the most people lived in the year 1847 had Pennsylvania Avenue from 1st to 21st streets as the southern line, 3d street, on the east to D, thence to 5th, to I, to 9th, and as far north on that street as L. The northern line began again at 9th and I streets, thence to New York Avenue and 15th Street. A further glimpse of the disproportion between the occupied portion and the entire area within urban bounds at this period is to be had from a statement by the president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co. when he described the site at New Jersey Avenue and C Street northwest, selected by the city council as the location for the depot, as in the suburbs of the city. From that point, he stated, to the northeastern boundary of the city, "not a single improvement has been projected."[2] The practical lack of sewers throughout this area, as well as the limited street lighting and also hours for street lighting, suggests village conditions. Up to the year 1850 the sewers from the public buildings about the White House had their outlet on the public grounds, a short distance south of that residence, where the flow stagnated and made a marsh.[3] The next year, however, the sewers were continued down 17th Street to the canal. At that time the sewers from the post-office and patent office buildings crossed 9th Street and emptied into a branch of the Tiber, still uncovered except at the streets, that flowed through the squares between 9th and 10th streets, to the canal.[1] At that time the city fathers were concerned because this watercourse, as well as others throughout the city, was allowed to remain unfenced. For the ravine through which it passed had a depth where it crossed F Street near 9th Street of some fourteen feet. The sidewalk as well as the carriage way was continued across by bridges that were without side rails, a source of danger, especially in the darkness of the unlighted streets. On one occasion when Philip R. Fendall, a leading member of the bar, fell into the ravine on F Street near 9th, and broke his leg in two places, the *Intelligencer* declared that it was due either to the negligence or parsimony of the city authorities that this crossing was left unprotected, as well as those on E and D streets.[2] Ten blocks to the north of the White House in the commons, in the vicinity of 15th and R streets northwest, was the place of deposit for the night-soil which was hauled there each day by the city government, without expense to the householder.[3] In the year 1855 a method was devised of treating it for agricultural purposes in an establishment located first on 14th Street near Florida Avenue, and then near Georgia Avenue.[4] These locations were far distant from the settled sections, if the city ordinance of March 29, 1849, was observed, which forbade the disposal of such material within 500 yards of any house, public road or street. The city corporation built no sewers, except for drainage purposes, and then, for the most part, this work was confined to enclosing the open streams in brick conduits.[5] Citizens were permitted, on the payment of a front-foot tax, to connect their houses with the city sewers, but only for the purpose of carrying off the water from the cellars.[6] Beyond providing sewers for the public buildings congress did nothing. Sewerless as Washington was in 1850, and as it continued to be for a good many years, that was not regarded at the time as so serious, and was not, in fact, under current conditions, as the inadequacy of the water-supply. For more than a third of a century the city had made use of the "rich gifts of nature of underground springs, which rise up whenever a well is dug" as well as the numerous watercourses.[1] Then in 1831 water was brought to the public buildings from a spring two miles to the north of the capitol and from the springs in Franklin Park. During the two decades following, the population of the city more than doubled, but no change was made in the method of water-supply. But it was no longer adequate. So great was the need, it was found to be impossible to prevent citizens from tapping the pipes that conducted the water to the public buildings.[2] The situation was a menace to life and property,[3] and by the coöperation of congress and the city council,[4] Colonel G. W. Hughes of the topographical bureau was employed in 1850, and made an examination of Rock Creek as a source of supply for Washington alone. Two years later, the scope of the inquiry was broadened, as a water-supply was wanted not alone for Washington but for Georgetown. No doubt emphasis was given to this need by the destruction of the principal room on the west front of the capitol, where the books of the library of congress were placed.[5] For while the combustible as well as the defective character of the construction was found to be the immediate cause of the fire, yet the lack of the means of extinguishing flames was also manifest. As was the case following the destruction of the early department buildings by fire, when new structures were erected they were made fireproof, so the new library room was built entirely of iron.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 13, 1847. Some sixty years later the court held this law was invalid.

[2] The same, June 29, 1849.

[3] 30th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 34, Jan. 16, 1849. Also 31st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 30, Jan. 24, 1850. Reports of Commissioner of Public Buildings.

---

[1] Ordinance, Feb. 19, 1852. It was not until 1858 that the section of the stream through the square between E and F streets was covered in. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 378.

[2] Jan. 22, 1838.

[3] *The Star*, Oct. 5, 1855.

[4] The same, March 26 and June 23, 1856.

[5] An early and exceptional instance of such construction not on the line of a watercourse was the extension of the government sewer on 9th Street from G Street to New York Avenue. Ordinance, Oct. 15, 1852.

[6] *The Star*, March 25 and April 6, 1857.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 1, 1849. Discussion of proposed waterworks, by Robert Mills.

[2] 31st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 30, Jan. 24, 1850. *Globe*, p. 2288, Aug. 21, 1852.

[3] *Globe*, p. 2288, Aug. 21, 1852.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 2, 1852.

[5] The same, Dec. 25, 1851. History of the Library of Congress, p. 275.

An investigation of all the available sources of water-supply was intrusted to Lieutenant M. C. Meigs of the engineer corps, U. S. A. and in his report to congress he discussed the Rock Creek source, as well as the Little and Great Falls sources, and while the estimate for the latter was about three quarters of a million of dollars more than the cheapest, which was Rock Creek, yet it was maintained that a supply from that source would be more certain and also more economical in maintenance, as no artificial power would be needed.[1] The report was clear and practical, the need was great, so that the approval of congress was given to a project which required a larger outlay of public money for the capital city than any other single expenditure in its history except for the capitol building. In less than two weeks after the Meigs report was sent to congress that body made an appropriation to begin the work.[2] The young lieutenant was placed in charge to carry out his plan, and so convinced were the citizens of Washington that the inauguration of this enterprise, so vital to their interests, was largely due to his report, that a silver water kettle and stand was presented to Lieutenant Meigs by the corporation of Washington, in recognition of this service.[3] While but little opposition was encountered by the measure in congress, yet an effort was made to get this privilege for a company.[4] When an application was made to the Maryland legislature to grant to the United States the right of way through Maryland territory, and to take water from the river, the measure was held up and delayed for a few weeks. For at that time another bill was pending before that body to incorporate the Potomac Water Co. for the purpose of supplying the cities of Washington and Georgetown with water.[5] The next year the failure of the house to make the annual appropriation for the aqueduct was attributed in part to a claim made by the Great Falls Manufacturing Co. for $150,000 as a condition of giving consent to the government building a dam or taking water from the river.[1] In commenting on this claim, it seemed to the *Intelligencer* that it was germane to the subject to mention "that no water-wheel has ever turned on its property." [2] However, the great undertaking was not permanently stayed by these obstacles. In ten years after the day, in November, 1853, when the work was formally inaugurated by Franklin Pierce, president of the United States, and a distinguished group of public men at Crommelin at the Great Falls,[3] the water flowed from the river through pipes protected in a brick conduit, 14 miles long, and carried over the Cabin John Run on a brick arch of unprecedented span to the city. The total cost was about three and one-half million dollars. At the end of six years, after a beginning had been made, water was brought into the city from the receiving reservoir at the Little Falls, supplied from Powder Mill Creek, a small tributary of the river.[4] The management of the aqueduct was placed in the hands of an engineer officer of the army, acting under the department of the interior, while authority was given to the town corporations to supply the towns with water from the mains without expense to the United States.[5] As the corporation was not authorized until the year 1863 to impose a tax, the cost of the early mains was defrayed by a bond issue. But Georgetown, in connection with an earlier project,[6] had been given that power. At first the town tried the plan of assessing the cost against the property; subsequently, however, reverting to a bond issue. At the outset of the movement, in 1850, to secure a water-supply, congress was asked to aid the Washington corporation in carrying out some plan for providing a sewer system.[1] In fact, at the session of congress when the final appropriation was made for a survey for a water-supply, the making of plans for drainage and sewerage was also authorized.[2] But as the money was also made available for the revision of the grades of the city, the preference was given to the grades, so nothing was done in regard to sewers.[3]

---

[1] 32d Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 48, Feb. 22, 1853.

[2] Stats., 10, 206, March 3, 1853.

[3] *The Star*, June 14, 1854.

[4] *Globe*, p. 2193, Aug. 21, 1852; also *Intelligencer*, Feb. 2, 1852.

[5] *Intelligencer*, April 4, 1853.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 27, 1854.

[2] An effort had been made the previous year to sell the stock of the company with the view of using the water-power for manufacturing purposes. *Intelligencer*, Oct. 7, 1853.

[3] This name was given to a hotel located there, and commemorated the Dutch banking house through which the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal loan was negotiated. *Intelligencer*, May 6, 1840.

[4] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 2, p. 299. Cabin John Bridge, by W. T. S. Curtis.

[5] Stats., 11, 435, March 3, 1859. At the close of the first year of water distribution the government had laid 30,646 feet of pipe to bring the water to public buildings and the corporation 20,020 feet for the citizens' supply. *The Star*, March 14, 1860, from official report.

[6] Stats., 10, 633, March 2, 1855.

At the outbreak of the civil war the drainage of at least one-third of the city flowed into the city canal through sewers provided for the most part in the first instance to carry off surface drainage.[4] While the lack of such an urban convenience was felt in the daily living, and in the more thickly built-up sections no doubt resulted in unwholesome conditions, yet there was no outbreak of disease until the spring of 1857, shortly after the inauguration of James Buchanan, when the National Hotel sickness occurred.[5] It was caused by poisonous gases from obstructed sewers and was confined in its extent to those in the building.[6] At that time the suggestion was made that the canal be turned into a sewer and that sewage lines be laid along all the streets leading to that waterway from the north.[7] As no provision was made to provide a sewer system, this suggestion was practically carried out in the desperation of a sewerless community.

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 1942, Sept. 23, 1850. Mayor's annual message. *Intelligencer*, Sept. 30, 1850. Joint resolution city council, Dec. 8, 1851.

[2] Stats., 10, 92, Aug. 31, 1852; also the same, p. 663, March 3, 1855.

[3] The street grades were determined by Randolph Coyle, who had served in 1846–1847 as surveyor of the city and had formerly been engaged in that work. (*Intelligencer*, April 17, 1851.) Mr. Coyle was employed as a civil engineer by the Topographical Bureau. Resolution city council, Sept. 25, 1856, and Ordinance, Aug. 4, 1859.

[4] *The Star*, April 6, 1857. Report of Commissioner of Public Buildings for 1859.

[5] The same, March 17 and 22, 1857.

[6] The same, July 16, 1857.

[7] The same, March 23, 1857.

The continued general good health of the city, even when, up to 1859, the water-supply was mainly drawn from the ground, was no doubt due to the adherence to the system of box rather than vault privies, so that the earth was not saturated with poison.[1]

In fact, the only epidemic in the history of the city was that of yellow fever in 1832, although seventeen years later there was another outbreak, but very slight in character.[2] The year following the first yellow fever visitation, smallpox was prevalent to some extent, as it had been five years earlier, and as it was some thirteen years later.[3] The recurrence of smallpox from time to time led the city council in 1841 to provide a building on the reservation on the Eastern Branch, where the city almshouse was later built, to be used as a contagious hospital.[4] The desperate situation of those so unfortunate as to contract a disease that was as generally dreaded as smallpox is indicated by an incident told of General Jackson, when eight years before this provision was made, his coachman who had been with him for many years was stricken with the disease. Although the other servants in the White House were at once vaccinated, yet they could not be persuaded to give the sick man proper attention. The president was unable to secure a nurse, and so he isolated himself with the patient, and looked after him until he was out of danger.[5] What proved in later years to be the principal menace to the health of the city, the malaria-breeding Potomac Flats, did not begin to have such a malign influence until about the opening of the decade of 1840. For while those masses of river deposits had reached such proportions as to be delineated on the first engraved map of the city, that of 1792, they had not grown so great as to have any large section exposed even at low tide. It may be concluded that the language of a warrant granted, three years after the city map was printed, by the Maryland land-office to Dr. William Thornton, at that time a member of the board of city commissioners, was partly imaginative. For the land covered by the warrant was described as thirty acres of an island or sandbar in the river, opposite the city and as "partly cultivated." The patent was not issued, and it may be concluded that the land described could not be located.[1] More than forty years later, or about the year 1838, a portion of the Flats was marked on a map of the river as "dry at low water."[2] This map was compiled from the surveys of the river opposite Georgetown made by Captain William Turnbull of the topographical engineers, and printed in 1832, and from the chart of the river made under the direction of Colonel James Kearney, and printed in 1834, on which, however, the exposed condition of a portion of the flats was not noted. The progress in the formation of the flats may be judged from a report made by a city council committee, ten years after the appearance of the 1838 map. For the committee found the swash channel from Easby's Point to 17th Street had disappeared, "and where, in 1833, vessels drawing seven feet of water could pass, the channel is obliterated and wild oats growing on the spot."[3]

---

[1] The death-rate was apparently low, although the health-office figures are of questionable accuracy. For in 1850 the rate is 21 per thousand, while ten years later, when the population had increased fifty per cent, the rate was thirteen. In Laws, 1860, p. 38. The rate in 1912 was 17.07.

[2] *Intelligencer*, June 22 and July 7, 1849. There were 13 cases and 7 deaths.

[3] Toner's Anniversary Oration, p. 76. Also *Intelligencer*, Jan. 14, 1846.

[4] The building was a slight affair, costing only $350, and was described as temporary. This provision was made at the suggestion of Dr. Harvey Lindsly, the president of the board of health. *Intelligencer*, June 16, 1841.

[5] Toner's Anniversary Oration, p. 77.

To the unwholesomeness of this partially submerged, marshy stretch was attributed the course of President Van Buren, whose term expired in the spring of 1841, in leasing a house on the heights of Georgetown, where he lived during the summer and fall months.[1] His successors, James K. Polk and Millard Fillmore, did not follow his example, but before the latter left the White House the first official note of warning was sounded, which was repeated throughout the years for nearly half a century before congress heeded, of the peril to the health of the city of the "extensive mud-flat" which "is now bared at low tide." [2] Then it was declared that when these river deposits become sufficiently elevated to form an island covered with vegetation, the miasmatic exhalations will increase to the injury of health. A year and a half later the writer of a communication in the *Intelligencer* was of the opinion that, if the river remains a morass, "as, if it is not entirely so now, it will be soon," trees should be planted along the banks, "as the foliage is a great protection from river miasma." [3] With the avowed purpose of escaping from unhealthful surroundings, President Pierce rented a house on Georgetown Heights, where he spent the summer and fall months.[4] His successor, James Buchanan, a few months after he came to the White House and in the spring of 1857, accepted an invitation from the managers of the Soldiers' Home, then in its third year, to occupy one of the cottages erected for the officers of the home.[5] At that period the locality of the White House was so generally accepted as unhealthy, that the suggestion became current of the need for a country residence for the president.[6] The reputation of the river flats as a cause of chills and fevers was apparently well established, even before the time of President Pierce, in the early fifties, as the section of the river front near the termination of G Street bore the name of Foggy Bottom.

---

[1] U. S. *vs.* M. F. Morris. Record, Vol. 7, p. 2462. Nearly three-quarters of a century afterwards a patent for a portion of this river-formed land was granted by the United States Land Office to John L. Kidwell, but its validity was not sustained.

[2] Chart of the head of navigation of the Potomac River, by W. M. C. Fairfax and M. C. Ewing, civil engineers.

[3] *Intelligencer*, April 20, 1848.

---

[1] A Complaint . . . upon the Subject of the Potomac Bridge, p. 34, by Henry Addison, mayor of Georgetown. Washington, 1856.

[2] Annual Report of Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds. 30th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 54, Jan. 12, 1848.

[3] June 25, 1849.

[4] The place was known as English Cottage. Souvenirs of My Time. Jesse Benton Fremont, p. 94.

[5] *The Star*, May 28, 1857. This house was later known as the quarters of the governor of the home.

[6] Report of Commissioner of Public Buildings. In secretary of interior report for 1857.

When the gas-works were established there in 1859, the residents rejoiced, as it was thought the fumes would "disinfect the Foggy Bottom chill so well known to the older members of the medical faculty."[1] The Potomac Flats were not the only sources of unhealth in the city. For the growth of the population had revealed the inadequacy of the system of sanitary regulation. While the old-time board of health, composed of civilians and doctors, appointed from each ward, and serving without pay, was not done away with, yet its function was reduced to mere supervision, as its powers and duties were transferred to a new official known as the commissioner of health. He was given a salary, and was required to devote his entire time to the work of the office, a change designed as a substitute for "the present impracticable and imperfect and expensive system."[2] In 1852, four years prior to the creation of the prototype of the modern health officer, the city council prohibited the location of new burial-grounds within the city limits.[3]

---

[1] *The Star*, August 1, 1859. But no suggestion was made of any beneficent influence on the neighborhood as coming from the old Lear warehouse which had just been fitted up for use as a fertilizing plant.

[2] The same, Nov. 27, 1855, and April 12, 1856; Ordinance, Jan. 17, 1856. Dr. A. McD. Davis was the first appointee.

[3] Ordinance, June 5, 1852. The urban cemeteries were as follows: the East Methodist or Ebenezer, belonging to Ebenezer Methodist Church, near the Congressional Cemetery; the West Methodist or Foundry, belonging to Foundry Methodist Church, between 13th and 14th streets near W Street; German Lutheran, between 4th, 5th, G and H streets northeast; German Catholic, between North Capitol, 1st, O and P streets northeast, belonging to the German Catholic Church on 5th Street; St. Peter's, between 4th and 5th, H and I streets northeast, belonging to St. Peter's Catholic Church; St. Patrick's, between 1st and 2d streets just north of Florida Avenue northwest, belonging to St. Patrick's Catholic Church; St. Matthew's, between 13th and 14th, U and V streets northwest, belonging to St. Matthew's Catholic Church; Eastern, between 13th and 14th, H and I streets northeast, belonging to the corporation; Western or Holmead, between 19th, 20th, S and T streets northwest, belonging to the corporation; the Methodist, between 12th, 13th, I streets and Florida Avenue northeast; Congressional, belonging to Christ Church, 17th and E streets southeast; Marine, east of Congressional Cemetery, belonging to the government; Washington Asylum or Potter's Field

As the Congressional Cemetery came to be the principal burial-place, a number of the cemeteries scattered throughout the city fell into disuse.[1] With the view of setting a good example, the corporation followed up its prohibitive legislation by directing that the bodies in the square where the old poorhouse stood on the north side of M Street between 6th and 7th streets northwest, as well as on the adjoining square to the north, be removed to the grounds about the new poorhouse on the reservation, 19th Street between B and E streets southeast.[2] A somewhat similar change in burial-places was going on in Georgetown, where the Presbyterian Cemetery, for many years the one mainly in use, had fallen into neglect. Four years before the Washington corporation found it necessary for the first time to legislate on the subject of cemeteries, Parrot Woods on the north side of R Street between 27th and 30th streets were purchased by W. W. Corcoran, the senior member of the banking firm of Corcoran and Riggs, whose father, Thomas Corcoran, was one of the early mayors of the town. He improved the grounds, erected a chapel and a house for the superintendent, and dedicated Oak Hill Cemetery as a burial-place for the use of the citizens of his native town.[3] A few weeks before the Washington cemetery ordinance became a law, a movement was started [4] which resulted in the purchase of some ninety acres of land on the west side of Lincoln Avenue, then known as the old Bladensburg Road, and north of Adams

---

in Asylum Square, belonging to the corporation; St. John's, between 12th, 13th, R and S streets, belonging to St. John's Episcopal Church; Harmoneon, 5th, 6th, S streets and Florida Avenue, belonging to a company of colored people; Free Young Men's, 12th, 13th, V and W streets northwest, belonging to a company of colored people; burial-ground for colored persons between 16th, 17th, C and D streets southeast. *The Star*, May 11, 1857.

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 10, 1839.

[2] Resolution of city council, Dec. 16, 1852. A burial-place known as the Potter's Field had been in that locality for many years. *Intelligencer*, Dec. 9, 1840.

[3] Report of investigating committee appointed at a meeting of lot owners of Oak Hill Cemetery, Georgetown, 1869. Also Chronicles of Georgetown, p. 264. *Intelligencer*, Dec. 23, 1851.

[4] *Intelligencer*, May 21, 1852. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 356.

Street. In the course of a couple of years the property passed to the control of the Glenwood Cemetery Co. incorporated by congress.[1] Before the end of the year 1854, when the cemetery was dedicated,[2] the Rock Creek Church vestry laid out a portion of the glebe of the church as a cemetery.[3] Three years later the Catholic clergy of the city purchased about forty acres on the west side of the Bladensburg Road between Glenwood Cemetery and N Street, which became known as Mt. Olivet Cemetery, and added another to the list of what was spoken of at the time as a "rural cemetery." [4]

The following year the various German societies of the city attended the dedicating ceremonies of the new burial-place, Prospect Hill Cemetery, adjoining Glenwood Cemetery on the south, the property of the German Evangelical Church Society.[5] In the same locality to the east, the year Prospect Hill Cemetery was opened, sixteen acres were purchased by the Columbian Harmony Association, an organization of colored people, where its burial-place was established.[6] In addition to the disagreeable conditions and the inconveniences due to a night-soil disposal method, suitable only for a small community, the citizens suffered loss in property at river-flood periods, attributed to the lack of provision for carrying away surface drainage. As early as 1840 a heavy loss of property resulted from the backing up during a freshet of the water from the river into the drainage sewer which entered the canal between 9th and 10th streets. The houses and buildings in the section between D and E streets, south of the avenue, were flooded, as were the cellars under the stores on the north side.[7] Two years later, as the result of an unusually heavy rain,

---

[1] Stats., 10, 789, July 27, 1854. Oak Hill Cemetery was incorporated by act of congress of March 3, 1849.

[2] *The Star*, July 26, 1854. Rules and regulations of the Glenwood Cemetery, Washington, 1854. Account of the dedication appended.

[3] The same, Dec. 8, 1854.

[4] The same, June 26, 1857.

[5] The same, Sept. 27, 1858.

[6] The same, Oct. 21, 1858. The old cemetery occupying the square between 5th, 6th, S streets and Florida Avenue was sold for $4000. Twenty years before the association paid $500.

[7] *Intelligencer*, July 27, 1840.

Pennsylvania Avenue, from 1st to John Marshall Place, resembled a broad river.[1] As the result of a rainy spell some nine years later the water rose in the cellars of buildings on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 1st and 2d streets from one to four feet,[2] and the following spring the water in the river rose to a height that had not been equalled since the greatest freshet recorded, that of 1784. All the cellars in the lower part of the city were flooded to a depth of four or five feet, while on 12th Street, north of B Street, the water rose to a height of eighteen inches.[3] Large as was the provision by congress in 1853 for a water-supply, yet it was made at the close of a period marked by unusual expenditures of federal money in the city. For conditions in the city then reflected, as has always been the case, the growth of the country. At the capitol there were more committees than rooms for their use, while the department buildings were overcrowded, and a number of bureaus were in leased buildings.[4] These actual needs could have been supplied for less money than was expended. It is quite evident that to some degree, at least, both in congress and in the country at large, the conception was taking the shape of the representative character of these structures, that they were not mere shelters but symbols of the greatness and the dignity of the nation. Their surroundings were considered for the first time in the measure adopted for the improvement of the public grounds. The pride of nationality was expressed in the noble extension of the capitol building, the enlargement of the patent office and several years later of the treasury and post-office department buildings. From the time the inadequacy of the public buildings was first formally called to the attention of congress[5] to the authorization of the last of these measures a period of ten years elapsed. Private enterprise saw the opportunity, and in spite of the novelty in Washington of such an undertaking as the erection of buildings exclusively designed for government purposes, three such structures were put up in the year 1847.[1] These structures not only formed a new class in building, as far as their size was concerned, but also as to their height, although the tendency in the latter direction began in 1840, when the first four-story building in the city was erected.[2] At this period congress looked beyond the fences that enclosed the grounds of the capitol and of the president's house, where smooth lawns, luxuriant shrubbery and parterres of flowers made more striking the contrast with the state of the public grounds in the immediate vicinity, as well as throughout the stretch of the Mall designed to connect and make complete the setting of the two principal public buildings as well as to provide a place of recreation.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 26, 1842.

[2] The same, Aug. 11, 1851.

[3] The same, April 21, 1852.

[4] 28th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 185, Feb. 25, 1845.

[5] The same.

Just beyond the capitol fence, to the north and south, as well as to the west, the surface was deeply gullied, while beyond the stone wall to the south of the president's house gashes cut by the unregulated surface and sewer drainage gave a desolate appearance, which was not improved by the heaps of unsightly and filthy rubbish.[3] The stretch of the Mall from the capitol to the Potomac was entirely unimproved. The section just west of 1st Street was, as described some seven years before, "a magnificent Sahara of solitude and waste — appropriated as a cow pasture and frog pond, and decorated with a stone-cutter's yard, a slaughter-house and pig-pens." [4] Members of congress could also see the open places along Pennsylvania Avenue at the intersection of streets, those delightful triangular little parks of to-day, used as rubbish heaps,[1] and the desolate appearance of Lafayette Park, then merely graded and enclosed with a wooden fence,[2] and Franklin Park entirely untouched, while to the south of the capitol was the large Town House reservation, now known as Garfield Park, a series of gaping holes, where the gravel had been removed and used on the streets. They saw also that New Jersey Avenue, from the capitol, was not the extended thoroughfare delineated on the map, as it was cut off by the Tiber on the north and its use impaired by high embankments between B and C streets on the south. They also realized that the direct course from the capitol to the city hall, the post-office and interior departments was along Indiana Avenue, which was impassable on account of the ravine from 3d Street to midway between 1st and 2d streets, through which flowed one of the tributaries of the Tiber. It was a matter of common experience that Maryland Avenue, the link of roadway between the railway depot in the city and the steamboat wharves and the Long Bridge, was unimproved, and that 4½ Street, which was the approach to the arsenal and the penitentiary, was still a country road. These deficiencies in the city streets had been pointed out by the commissioner of public buildings in response to a senate resolution calling for information as to what streets and avenues public convenience required to be improved.[3] It is quite evident, from the streets selected, that the commissioner construed the phrase "public convenience" as understood by congress to mean federal convenience. In addition, a further motive for this unprecedented interest in city streets was supplied by the commissioner when he added, in explanation of the need of congressional aid, "as the city resources are not adequate."[1] But why are they not adequate, was asked on the floor of the senate at the opening of this period of unusual federal expenditure. The talk of an overburden of taxation in Washington could not be real, continued this objector, for in Columbus, Ohio, the taxes are three times what they are in Washington, while in Cincinnati the assessment is double.[2] On the other hand, another senator declared that unless congress is liberal in regard to streets and buildings and so forth, it is utterly impossible this city can be as convenient as it ought to be for the purposes for which it was designed. He would vote for District measures on high national grounds.

---

[1] Two of them, the Winder building at the northwest corner of 17th and F streets, erected by W. H. Winder of Philadelphia, and the Corcoran building at the southeast corner of 15th and F streets, erected by W. W. Corcoran, were five stories in height, while the third, erected for the coast survey on the east side of New Jersey Avenue between B and C streets southeast, was three stories high and of fireproof construction, as was the case with the Winder building. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, pp. 335–336.

[2] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 321.

[3] 30th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 24, Jan. 12, 1848.

[4] *Intelligencer*, March 24, 1841. Address of Joel R. Poinsett before the National Institution.

---

[1] The first of these open places to be enclosed was the one on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 13th and 14th streets. Commissioner of Public Buildings, report for 1852.

[2] A phase of one point of view in regard to the liberal provision for parks so unusual in cities of that day is illustrated by a recommendation of a house committee that Lafayette Park be utilized for the erection of five residences for the use of cabinet officers, which, however, passed unnoticed. 28th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 185, Feb. 25, 1845.

[3] 29th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 11, Dec. 15, 1845.

In undertaking, three years after the report had been made, the schedule of street improvements recommended by the commissioner of public buildings, congress, the largest property holder, for the first time spent money on streets outside of Pennsylvania Avenue.[3] This change in policy, although not made the subject of discussion in either house, attracted attention at the time. It was described as liberal by the mayor, W. W. Seaton, in his annual message,[4] while the members of the two District committees, the speaker of the house and others were entertained at dinner at the National Hotel by the citizens of Washington in recognition of the benefits conferred by this legislation.[5] As it proved, "the liberal spirit" was not the expression of a definite policy. The nearest approach made at this time to giving permanency to a recognition of the relations of the general government to the city, merely as a property holder, was the clause in the charter of 1848, directing the commissioner of public buildings to open and improve such avenues and streets as the president of the United States, upon the application of the city authorities, shall direct to be done, and to defray "the expenses thereof out of any money arising, or which shall have arisen, from the sale of lots in the city of Washington, belonging, or which may have belonged, to the United States, and from no other source." This attempt to utilize the public lots failed, as it had on previous occasions, for the same reason, because the receipts from that source were very slight. Although if the contention of citizens had been recognized, that the law was retroactive and involved the entire receipts derived from the sale of lots from the beginning, an aggregate of about three-quarters of a million of dollars, then the enactment would have had practical results.[1] As it was, a year and a half later, the receipts accumulated from current sales of public lots were only about $13,000, which was about equal to the initial appropriation for the Indiana Avenue improvement.[2] Congress seemed to realize the city would not be helped very much by this legislation, for at the same session in 1848 provision was made for completing the cobble pavement of Pennsylvania Avenue and for the improvement of Indiana Avenue and 4½ Street. In the course of the next two or three years Maryland Avenue west, and New Jersey Avenue south, were included in the federal schedule. Then, with the exception of sections of 15th and 17th streets and B Street south, from 7th to 14th, all in the vicinity of public property, congress gave up this form of contribution toward municipal expenses.

---

[1] A few years later, on account of the drain on the city funds of the city canal and other expenditures, street improvements were entirely suspended. Mayor's messages. In Laws, 1852 and 1853.

[2] *Globe*, p. 524, Feb. 13, 1849.

[3] Stats., 9, 296, Aug. 12, 1848.

[4] In Laws, 1848, Aug. 14, 1848.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 25, 1848.

For after all, as the mayor of the city, John T. Towers, expressed it, when looking back over this period of city improvement, it was due to "the liberality of congress so kindly and generously" bestowed.[3] No doubt, as he rather glowingly phrased it, there was present the motive that the city was regarded not only "as the seat of national sovereignty, but as a common bond of affection and union." Still there was no recognized obligation to continue such legislation, as there had been none to begin it. The money had been voted, but not because of any legal or generally acknowledged right, or in pursuance of any accepted policy. The need for federal aid in street improvements was still urgent when congress stopped. At the next session congress might again incline to vote money for local purposes. No man could tell. This want of certainty in federal and city relations was the canker that lay at the heart of efficiency in local government. The case was clearly diagnosed by Jacob Thompson, who, as secretary of the interior, was brought in contact with District affairs, as he had general supervision of government expenditures in the District.[1] He attributed this condition to a natural feeling of distrust in congress, in regard to District measures, because of the varied and numerous demands. As he pointed out in his annual report for 1858, the meritorious are confused with those that are without justice and merit. This state of affairs was due, he thought, to the lack of a well-defined rule or system. If some understanding could be reached, he explained, the corporate authorities could know what expenditures they are expected to make, and what fairly and justly devolve upon the general government. He therefore urged that in lieu of all appropriations for the city "an annual appropriation be made proportionate in amount to the value of the property owned by and held for the exclusive use of the United States within the District, to be applied in such manner and for such objects as congress shall approve." Such an adjustment of federal and District relations was first urged upon congress by the city council in 1835, and reiterated in the annual messages of the mayor of 1841 and 1847. Only two years before the secretary of the interior made this recommendation the same policy had been outlined in a report of the senate District committee.[2] But the time was not ripe. It is quite clear, as has been stated, that the street improvements made at this time by congress were mainly designed for the convenience of federal business. But the type of street surface was not federal, but rather that imposed on the corporation by its slender means, so that the cheaper gravel was used instead of cobblestones. In the case of Indiana Avenue, from 3d Street to beyond 2d Street, it was not merely a question of a street surface, as this section was a deep ravine along which flowed one of the tributaries of the Tiber that passed in a southerly course from G Street between 4th and 5th streets, and thence in a diagonal direction through Judiciary Square. A culvert of brick about 1000 feet long was built in the Indiana Avenue ravine, and an arched bridge of the same material over the Tiber.[1] Two years later, the corporation made provision for continuing the work of changing this open stream, along which flowed the drainage of a large section of the city, into an underground course by building a sewer from 5th and G streets to 6th Street, and along G and thence to Massachusetts Avenue,[2] with the expectation that congress would continue the Indiana Avenue conduit through Judiciary Square.[3] As congress did not provide for covering in this section until 1856, the corporation work was delayed,[4] which was only another instance of the inefficiency of a system of city improvements under two entirely independent authorities.

---

[1] 31st Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 47, March 3, 1851, p. 20.

[2] In the year 1844 the public lots unsold numbered 1755, with an assessed value of $64,153, while fourteen years later the number had fallen to 118, assessed value $6969. 28th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 267, April 2, 1844; 35th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 5, Dec. 10, 1858.

[3] Mayor's message. In Laws, 1854.

---

[1] A clause in the civil and diplomatic appropriation bill of Aug. 4, 1854 (Stats., X, 573), directed the commissioner of public buildings and grounds thereafter to make annual reports though the secretary of the interior instead of directly to congress.

[2] *The Star*, April 1, 1856. Report on memorial of the public schools asking for a donation of public lots.

Before the work on New Jersey Avenue south of the capitol was undertaken by the government, the city authorities reduced the grade four feet on the east side, and two feet on the west side, between B and C streets. When it came to a change in the grade on Maryland Avenue, from 11th to the river, some of the property owners refused their consent unless the cost of the necessary changes in their property was paid, so that only the section from 7th to 11th streets was graded at that time.[1] The delay, as it proved, was only temporary, as the following year the circuit court decided that the power of grading and regrading the public streets was to be exercised by the corporation as often as the health, improvement and prosperity of the city makes necessary, and that the loss to property holders is in the nature of consequential damages. Nor was it incumbent, the court concluded, to make any compensation for individual injuries.[2]

---

[1] 31st Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 47, March 3, 1851.

[2] Ordinance, Aug. 16, 1853.

[3] Report Commissioner of Public Buildings for 1855.

[4] Stats., XI., 89, Aug. 18, 1856. For twelve years after the old jail building had been turned into a hospital and the new jail was completed and some eight years after the exterior of the city hall was finished the stream through Judiciary Square was uncovered.

---

[1] 32d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 79, Feb. 20, 1852. Report of Commissioner of Public Buildings; also report for 1855.

[2] Circuit Court Reports. Haywood and Hazelton, Vol. 2, pp. 122 and 220. Decided Sept. 19, 1853, and May 23, 1856.

CHAPTER XII

CONGRESS AND THE MALL

When, in 1848, the scope of federal street improvement work was broadened so as to include other thoroughfares than Pennsylvania Avenue, congress turned its attention to the Mall. Then the section between 7th Street and the Potomac was graded, trees were planted and an enclosure provided.[1] Fifteen years had passed since an appropriation had been made for the care of this great stretch of park. Then the amount was so small that but little change was effected in its appearance. At the time of the second attempt the erection of the stately Norman building for the Smithsonian Institution, on the section of the Mall between 7th and 12th streets, was in progress.[2] Congress had just given authority to the Washington Monument Society to locate the monument to the first president in the section west of 15th Street, and also appropriated money to improve the portion of the city canal within the limits of the public grounds. While federal interests were served by the latter expenditure, local interests were benefited, as the government funds spent on the canal supplemented what the city authorities were doing in getting that waterway in readiness for the expected western coal trade. However, one of the senators saw in this measure more of local than of national benefit, and while he opposed the canal grant, yet he recognized the hopelessness of opposition in a period of unusual federal efforts to improve the city. For he declared that "it was useless to oppose District appropriations, because the District, having nobody to represent it on the floor, has everybody."[1] By the close of 1849 the section of the Mall where the Smithsonian building stood was graded, planted with trees and enclosed with a wooden fence; the capitol grounds to the north and south were extended to B Street, and the ground south of the president's house graded and drained.[2] Two years later the commissioner of public buildings, "at the suggestion of several prominent gentlemen of this city, and by the approbation of President Fillmore," secured the services of A. J. Downing of Newburg, N. Y., distinguished for a cultivated taste in landscape designing, to prepare a plan for the improvement of the entire Mall.[3] With the approval of the president, this plan, which proposed a succession of connected parks, with continuous walks and drives, was adopted. For more than a year the work of improving the first section selected, that on which the Smithsonian building stood, was carried on under the personal direction of Mr. Downing.[4] Then his death occurred. The work was continued for a time, and advanced so far that by the summer of 1853 the Smithsonian grounds, as they came to be known, were used as a resort by the citizens.[5] It was, however, the only portion of the great domain, except the Botanic Garden, that was cared for. In the course of a few years, as the shadows of the civil war advanced, the annual appropriations ceased altogether, so that it was impossible to preserve in proper condition what had been done.[6] At that time the appearance of the ground showed a "gracefully natural disposition of the shrubbery in clumps of foliage, with open spaces of lawn, after the English fashion."[1] An indication of the popular use of the grounds is to be found, no doubt, in the placing there of iron chairs,[2] following in this respect the practice begun more than twenty-two years before, when the capitol grounds were thus equipped, and after a long interval, also the grounds about the president's house.[3] While the stately walls of the Smithsonian building were rising on the Mall and the shaft of the Washington Monument steadily ascending,[4] a modest structure had been built in the section west of 1st Street between Pennsylvania and Maryland avenues for the public greenhouse and botanic specimens, as the space where the frame buildings on the patent office square used for that purpose was needed for the extension of the patent office.[5] This change of location also marked a change in policy, as it resulted in the establishment of a botanic garden under direct governmental control. The Columbian Institute had been given the use of a portion of the public grounds between 1st Street and the circular road about the capitol for a botanic garden, and some attempt was made to carry out the design. But the Institute did not prosper, and in 1836, a couple of years before it went out of existence, the site of the garden was included within the grounds of the capitol, which were extended to 1st Street.[6]

---

[1] Stats., 9, 294, Aug. 12, 1848.

[2] Mayor W. W. Seaton in his annual message declared that "since the legislation of the year 1814 and the rebuilding of the capitol nothing has occurred calculated to exert such an influence on the fortunes of the city, even unto the most distant future, as the founding of this great and annually growing institution." *Intelligencer*, Aug. 28, 1846. Also in Laws.

---

[1] *Congressional Globe*, p. 546, Feb. 16, 1847.

[2] Commissioner of Public Buildings Reports for 1847, 1848 and 1849.

[3] 31st Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 47, March 3, 1851.

[4] Commissioner of Public Buildings Report, in report of secretary of interior for 1859.

[5] *Intelligencer*, July 2, 1853.

[6] Report of Commissioner of Public Buildings, in secretary of interior's report for 1859.

When the second scientific society of the city, the National Institution, was formed in the spring of 1841, the botanic collection of the Wilkes expedition of 1838, that had been kept in Philadelphia, was brought to Washington and placed in charge of that body of representative men of the city and, through associate membership, of the country.[1] The society was granted the use of rooms in the patent office, and was made the custodian of other governmental scientific collections, forming the nucleus of a national museum.[2] Besides the rooms in the patent office, a portion of the botanic collection was kept in two small frame buildings used as hothouses, on the northern section of the patent office square. At the height of its career the Institution had a membership of 1600. In 1844, upon its invitation, was held in Washington the first national congress of American men of science. When the Smithsonian Institution came into existence, the Institution practically ended its days.[3] Its collections fell to the care of the commissioner of patents. Soon after the extension of the patent office building was begun, the joint committee on the library selected as the new site of the government hot houses the section of the Mall between 1st and 3d streets, Pennsylvania and Maryland avenues.[4] The frame buildings were removed to the location that soon became known as the botanic garden, and were placed in charge of W. D. Brackenridge, who was the botanist of the Wilkes expedition, and was made the custodian of the botanical collection after its removal to Washington.[5]

---

[1] *The Star*, Dec. 24, 1858.

[2] The same, Sept. 12, 1860.

[3] Stats., 5, 67, July 7, 1838, and Stats., 10, 92, Aug. 31, 1852.

[4] In 1854, six years after the laying of the corner-stone, a height of 150 feet was reached, and that was the elevation when congress in 1880 undertook the work of building. History of the Washington National Monument and Society, pp. 48 and 98. 57th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 224, Feb. 6, 1903.

[5] 31st Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 47, March 3, 1851.

[6] Congress, by an appropriation of July 4, 1836 (Stats., 5, 114), provided for bringing "the surplus water of the capitol to the Botanic Garden, making a basin and purchasing a fountain of Hiram Powers," but there is no further record of the *fountain* or allusion to the garden.

The garden flourished under the patronage of congress, and in 1859, some seven years after it was established, was spoken of "as a pleasant place to visit, with gravel walks, bordered with box, rare plants and trees cared for by Mr. Smith."[1] The establishment, in 1852, of a botanic garden was not the first essay made by the government in providing, in a permanent way, for scientific research. For at that time the coast survey had been in existence for twenty years, and the naval observatory or depot of charts, as it was first termed, was completing its first decade. In addition, practically all of the expeditions sent out to explore the unknown region of the west, beginning with that of Lewis and Clark in 1803, as well as the ocean voyages of Gilliss and Wilkes, had in view the collection of material useful in the diffusion of knowledge. A noted English geologist, G. W. Featherstonhaugh, in 1834, had charge of the sixth United States exploring expedition in the west.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 28, 1841. Genesis of the U. S. National Museum, G. Brown Goode.

[2] In addition to the Wilkes collection there was a collection of mineralogical and geographical specimens collected by the corps of topographical engineers, the collection of Indian portraits from the war department, the books, minerals and works of art of the Columbian Institute and the books and papers of the American Historical Society.

[3] Smithsonian Report, 1897, Vol. 2, p. 470.

[4] 31st Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 47, March 3, 1851.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 11, 1848, and Nov. 6, 1850.

The city became the centre where were sent meteorological data collected by observers stationed all over the country. As early as 1817 reports on weather conditions were made by registers of land-offices, supplemented the following year by reports from medical officers at army posts. Finally in 1848, under the direction of Professor Joseph Henry, reports were received at the Smithsonian from telegraph operators wherever stationed, and a beginning made in having a map showing current conditions leading to the making of weather forecasts. The broadening of the scientific work of the government began at an early day to bring to Washington men trained in various branches, so that by 1887 it was estimated there was one scientific man to every 500 of inhabitants.[2] As early as 1861 these men of kindred tastes and pursuits formed a society for social intercourse and exchange of views. The Potomac Club, an organization of naturalists, brought together fourteen men,[3] while later on meetings of the Scientific Club, with about the same membership, were held at the houses of the members.[1]

---

[1] *The Star*, Oct. 10, 1859. William R. Smith, a pupil of the Kew botanical garden, then but recently in charge of the garden, a position which he held until his death in 1912. At that time had just passed away James Maher, who for a quarter of a century had the care of the public grounds with the official title of public gardener. Commissioner of Public Buildings' Report for 1859.

[2] Smithsonian Report, 1897, Vol. 2, p. 463. Estimate of G. Brown Goode.

[3] Recollections of Lincoln, Chittenden, p. 239.

What is now the chief beauty of the city, the trees that border the streets and adorn the parks, at a comparatively early day claimed the attention of those caring for the public property. For ten years following 1838, an average of $300 a year was spent by congress in the purchase of trees. Then the section of Garfield Park west of New Jersey Avenue came into use as a public nursery to supply this demand.[2]

The beauty of the trees did not escape comment, for it was observed that "nothing has attracted the notice of visitors as the handsome trees about the public grounds and along Pennsylvania Avenue."[3] For the most part, the further effect in landscape designing, that comes from the placing of statuary and fountains, was left to the period that came after the civil war. On the west terrace of the capitol, however, was the Tripoli Monument, that had been brought from the navy yard in 1831 and placed on a pedestal in the centre of a stone-faced reservoir that received a portion of the water that had just then been brought to the capitol.[4] In the enclosure on the east side of the capitol was another reservoir of water, while in the centre of the grounds had been placed, by the year 1843, the colossal marble statue of Washington, executed by Horatio Greenough, by direction of congress. In 1841, nine years after the commission had been given, the statue reached the city. The problem of handling the great bulk of twenty tons was a serious one. It was brought by boat up the Eastern Branch to the mouth of the city canal, and thence along that waterway to Maryland Avenue, and then, placed on a platform, was drawn by means of capstans to the capitol.[1] For two years it stood in the rotunda, and then was removed to the grounds east of the building, where at first it was protected from the weather by a barn-like structure of wood. When the covering was removed, it was observed, that while the appearance had been improved, yet "the spectator will always be shocked by the nudity of the figure." [2] The period of attention given to the appearance of the public grounds was further emphasized by placing in front of the White House the bronze statue of Thomas Jefferson, presented to congress eleven years before, but not accepted by that body. It had been moved about from place to place in the capitol, now in the rotunda and then again stored away in the basement.[3] At this time it was said that it was the only statue in the country made of bronze. It was cast abroad, so that the equestrian statue of General Andrew Jackson, designed by Clark Mills, was the first made in this country.[4] In 1853 this statue, set up in Lafayette Square, was dedicated with appropriate ceremonies, while seven years later the circle at Pennsylvania Avenue and 23d Street was the scene of ceremonies of similar character when the equestrian statue of George Washington, also by Clark Mills, was unveiled.[5] Following the placing of the Jackson statue in Lafayette Park, improvements were made in the grounds, and by 1853 the wooden fence was replaced by one of iron with gates, while five years later the city council, the sponsor for unnamed thoroughfares in the city, christened the streets on the east and west sides, Madison and Jackson Places, respectively.[1] The improvement of Washington Circle, as the open space at Pennsylvania Avenue and 23d Street came to be known, preceded by several years the placing of the statue there,[2] but the ground was not enclosed with an iron fence until after the dedication ceremonies.[3] It is quite evident that in the absence of the fence the improvement up to that time was limited to the grading of the ground, as under current conditions then, and for a number of years later, geese and hogs roamed the streets, and this accounts in part for the money spent on enclosing public grounds, even the small triangular spaces.[4] No doubt the money spent on New Jersey Avenue south of the capitol, as well as the menace to the health of the city from the open gravel pits in the reservation of Garfield Park, where stagnant water collected, explains this park improvement in a locality so remote from the centre of population.[5] For after the cavities were filled, the ground graded and enclosed, the commissioner of public buildings advised that, until the locality became more populous and adjacent streets were opened, further improvement be delayed.[6] Congress acted on this advice. For nearly half a century this public space, the largest of the original reservations except the Mall, was uncared for. It was not wanted, either by the government or the city corporation, as a building site. In fact, with the exception of the Western Market Square in the river low grounds on B Street between 20th and 21st streets northwest, this reservation was the only one of the original seventeen reservations, after 1848, still in public ownership, that was not occupied in some part by a building.

---

[1] In 1863 the members were Joseph Henry, A. D. Bache, Peter Parker, Simon Newcomb, J. E. Hilgard, George C. Schaeffer, A. A. Humphreys, Jonathan H. Lane, W. B. Taylor, Titian H. Peale, Benjamin N. Craig, J. M. Gilliss, J. N. McComb, O. M. Poe, M. C. Meigs, F. A. P. Barnard. Men and Manners, McCulloch, p. 288.

[2] 32d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 79, Feb. 20, 1852. Also Commissioner of Public Buildings' Report for 1848. The disagreeable odor of the alanthus tree led to the insertion of a clause in the civil and diplomatic appropriation bill of March 3, 1853 (Stats., 10, 207), directing that no more of that variety be purchased or planted.

[3] *Intelligencer*, April 14, 1843. Among the varieties commonly planted were silver poplar, elm, alanthus, linden, sycamore and maple.

[4] New Guide to Washington. George Watterston, 1842. Eighteen years later the monument was removed to the grounds of the Naval Academy. *The Star*, July 20, 1860. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 14, p. 28.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 22, 1841.

[2] The same, Sept. 14, 1846. The statue remained in that place until 1908, when it was removed to the shelter of the Smithsonian building.

[3] The same, Aug. 9, 1841. Reference to the "negro image" of Mr. Jefferson in the rotunda. Picture of Washington, p. 12, 1845.

[4] The same, Dec. 22, 1848.

[5] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 5. Equestrian Statuary in Washington. S. H. Kauffmann.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 30, 1858. An ordinance of Feb. 11, 1859, corrected what was evidently an error in designating them as streets rather than places.

[2] The same, Aug. 15, 1853.

[3] Stats., 12, 108, June 25, 1860.

[4] *The Star*, July 23, 1860. Complaints about geese and hogs roaming the streets and the hog wallows in Judiciary Square just north of the city hall.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 6, 1849. Comments of a writer who described Washington as a cluster of villages. The part between the president's house and the capitol, he observed, may be regarded as the city proper, and the section west of 15th Street, the Island, Capitol Hill and the navy yard as so many suburbs.

[6] 31st Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 47, March 3, 1851; 32d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 79, Feb. 20, 1852.

It retained this distinction until, in recent years, the power-house for the heating and lighting of the capitol and adjacent public buildings was located on the western portion. Some ten years prior to the building of the Smithsonian, the city almshouse, with the consent of the president, was located on Hospital Square on the Eastern Branch.[1] While three years later, on University Square at 23d and E streets northwest, the building for the Naval Observatory was erected.[2]

The location of the buildings of the Botanic Garden, the placing of the Smithsonian Institution and the Washington Monument on the Mall still left abundant sites in that great stretch, and it was there, just east of 7th Street, that in 1855 congress built an armory for the use of the volunteers and militia of the District, and for a military museum.

The course of legislation relating to the public grounds can be best understood when interpreted in the light of a growing consciousness of Washington as a national centre. For while, prior to 1830, congress seemed to look upon the generous provision for parks and public spaces as beyond either federal or local needs, yet an awakening, not so much as to the possibilities of the site as to its federal importance, is to be found in the reasons which led congress, in 1833, to recall its action in diverting from public uses a large section of the Mall. But even in this act, it will be recalled, a broad strip through the centre was retained, thus preserving the vista from the capitol to the Potomac. It may be concluded, in absence of any contemporary explanation, that this was not the result of a study of L'Enfant's plan. There was also no thought of adhering to the city's plan in the location either of the Smithsonian or the armory. As it happened, however, both were placed in harmony with the original design of the Mall, which L'Enfant pictured on his map as bordered with buildings.

---

[1] Joint Resolution of City Council, April 16, 1839. The building was completed in 1844.

[2] Stats., 5, 76, Aug. 31, 1842. The building was completed in the fall of 1844.

Differences of opinion developed when the regents of the Smithsonian submitted, as required by law, their choice of a site for the approval of President Polk and his cabinet. The regents favored a location between 7th and 12th streets, while the president regarded the stretch west of 12th Street as more elevated and therefore better adapted for the purpose.[1] As W. W. Seaton, who, as mayor of the city, was ex officio a member of the board of regents, favored the eastern location, and as the president had been told that the property holders in the vicinity of Centre Market were of the same mind, he thought a mistake had been made in giving a citizen of Washington a place on the board. In addition, it was thought the regents wanted a larger plot of ground than was really necessary. However, a compromise was made. The southern half of the Mall between 9th and 12th streets was selected. The president gave his approval. Then the building committee of the regents fixed upon the location of the building near the southern border.[2] It may be concluded that the selection of the place for the armory, left to the secretary of war, who chose the portion of the Mall between 4½ and 7th streets, was influenced by the proximity of the canal, so that it was also placed near the southern boundary.[3] It is probable the local influence, referred to by President Polk as the interests of the property holders in the vicinity of the Centre Market, or what was, in fact, the principal section of the city, was felt during the entire time the Smithsonian location was being considered. It was not merely the narrow selfish view of those personally interested that favored that general locality. For congress in creating the Smithsonian named the northern portion of the patent office square as a place, if the site commission approved, and if not, they could select any other portion of the public grounds. There was another local interest besides merely one of property values that saw in the Smithsonian project an opportunity to rid the city of a conspicuous example of the discrepancy between municipal ambition and municipal resources. For the city hall stood as it had for more than a quarter of a century, "little better in appearance than one of the ancient ruins of the old world." [1]

---

[1] Diary of James K. Polk, Vol. 2, pp. 124, 264, 272 and 284. September – December, 1846.

[2] 30th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 23, Jan. 6, 1848. Exact site determined March 20, 1847.

[3] *Intelligencer*, April 30, 1855.

It was not the first opportunity of the sort, for five years before, in 1840, when it was proposed to erect a building for the city post-office, the city council offered to provide a place in the municipal building upon the condition that an appropriation be made by congress for the completion of the building.[2] At this time it was suggested that congress take the city hall for the Smithsonian and provide money for the erection of a municipal building on Centre Market Square.[3] Even after the Mall location had been determined upon, a bill was offered in the senate, providing for the purchase of the city hall for the use of the Institution, on the condition the city erect a suitable building on the Market Square adapted for the city's use.[4] Finally near the close of a decade of efforts to interest congress in the building, the reproach of its unfinished condition was removed. No doubt the need of providing more room for the courts had much to do with securing action. Yet the thought of the city as the national centre had an influence. For when the city hall appropriation was up in the senate, it was declared that District affairs should be considered on "high national grounds." [5] While that sentiment was expressed, yet congress made no change in the policy that had been so largely followed from the beginning, and that regarded national interests in the federal city as separate from those of the city itself. A sum of money was appropriated, designed to supplement what had been provided twenty-six years before, to pay for fitting up rooms in the then recently erected city hall, for the use of the court and its officers. The two sums, according to the careful congressional estimate, were just exactly one-half of the original cost of the building. The courts occupied that much of the space. As a condition of this grant, it was provided the money should be used in completing the exterior of the building. When this was done, and the $30,000 was spent in stuccoing the exterior walls and erecting the central portico, as well as those of the wings,[1] the half-and-half ownership, suggested by the language of the law, was considerably out of balance on the city's side. This was increased by further provision, which required that sufficient room be set aside for the use of the United States in the District. As the eastern section of the building occupied by the United States was already overcrowded, the only relief that could be given was to go into the western section occupied by the city offices. So the use of the common council chamber was granted to the criminal court, but as the city fathers continued to meet there, the room was not used as a court-room except when the sessions of the two courts conflicted. The city hall looked better as a result of this legislation, but it was no larger, and more room was needed "for the use of the United States in the District," as congress was informed some six years later.[2] The change in the appearance of the city hall was of benefit to the entire city, because of its conspicuous location, and it was also an improvement in the general section of the city that was the most populous and well to do. It was not long before the appearance of Centre Market was pronounced to be "unseemly."[3] For with the exception of the Perseverance fire-engine house[1] and the police station, the market square was filled with a confused medley of huts and shacks, in the midst of which stood the original building that was still the market, — a long, low structure of frame, with its whitewashed walls and moss-covered roof. A shed had been built along the avenue front of the market building to provide a shelter for the country people. Now, however, they had increased so in number that on market-days their wagons filled the broad expanse of Pennsylvania Avenue from 7th to 11th streets. Along the 7th and 9th street fronts, hastily built frame sheds were occupied by cook-shops and all kinds of dealers.[2] But they all paid rent to the city, and that jumble of mean-looking structures was one of the principal sources of the city's revenue. While there were three other city markets, yet it was said, as early as 1854, that nineteen-twentieths of the people used the Centre Market.[3] When, however, it was proposed to do away with such an unsightly place on the city's leading thoroughfare, and erect a fine building, 560 feet long, with a grand central entrance, a rotunda and a clock-tower, at a cost of $100,000,[4] it was declared to be merely a ward improvement. The other sections of the city were arrayed against it, especially as it was planned to make use of the city's credit.[5] But as the advocates of a new market-house on the principal thoroughfare of the city could demonstrate, to borrow the money would not really add to the debt of the city, for the revenue would be

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 30, 1845. Report of Common Council Committee on Tax Reduction.

[2] The same, Feb. 12, 1840.

[3] The same, Jan. 27, 1845.

[4] Smithsonian Institution, Vol. 1, p. 438, Feb. 15, 1847.

[5] *Congressional Globe*, p. 523, Feb. 13, 1849.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 7, 1849. Stats., 9, 362, March 3, 1849.

[2] Commissioner of Public Buildings' Report, in secretary of interior's report for 1855, p. 7. At that time the extension of the wings was advocated.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 30, 1851.

---

[1] The building was destroyed by fire in 1855 and a building at 8th and Market Space on the opposite side of Pennsylvania Avenue became the home of the company. *Intelligencer*, Nov. 23 and 29, 1855.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 14 and Aug. 30, 1851. Commissioner of Public Buildings' Report for 1857.

[3] Mayor's Message, p. 161. In Laws, 1854. The increase in the revenue from markets is shown by the following figures taken from financial statements appended to the laws of the corporation for the years named.

	1851	1854	1857	1860
Butcher stalls	$3,125	$3,779	$5,748	$11,450
Vegetable and fish stalls .	4,284	6,882	6,799	15,842
	$7,409	$10,661	$12,547	$27,292

[4] *Intelligencer*, July 14, 1851. Robert Mills' plan.

[5] The same, Nov. 21, 1853.

ample to meet the fixed charge and also provide a sinking fund for the payment of the principal. The city council apparently was favorably inclined.[1] To add to the city debt, it was necessary to get the consent of two-thirds of the legal voters. The question was never submitted, as it was realized that the people in other wards would not be likely to favor such an improvement, when there was not enough money for the streets.[2] So dust accumulated on the fine market-house plans. The old market-house remained. A change, however, was made in conditions, as it could no longer be tolerated that Pennsylvania Avenue be blocked up each market-day. A building was erected along the canal for the use of the country people, and then the avenue front was cleared of the sheds.[3] The increase in the revenue of the market, even in its primitive state, and the promise of greater returns from a suitable building kept the new project alive. The sentiment of the community, however, did not change much, and so finally an appeal was made to congress to set aside the debt provision of the city charter. Instead of allowing the people of the city to say whether or not they wished to add to their debt, congress decided for them. But the measure did not get through without a struggle. So decided was the opposition to such an invasion of civic rights, that the bill was sent to conference. As it became a law, the city council was given authority to borrow $200,000.[4] A few months later Lincoln was elected, the war clouds gathered and the market-house project dropped out of sight.

But while the Centre Market improvement agitation continued for almost a decade, that was not typical of all attempted at this period. For the foundations of that great institution, the government hospital for the insane, were laid in 1852, where not only the insane of the District were to be cared for, but also those of the army and navy.[1] The previous year another great institution had been established as a home for invalid and disabled soldiers of the United States.[2] A broad area was secured for the insane asylum beyond the city limits, on the elevated ground between the Potomac and the Anacostia rivers, while east of Georgia Avenue and north of Michigan Avenue an ample domain was purchased for a military asylum or soldiers' home. Five or six years later another institution was established. As provided in the charter granted by congress, it was known as the Columbia Institution for the deaf, dumb and blind. While congress defrayed the cost of those of that class in the District who were indigent, admission was permitted from the states and territories on such terms as the authorities of the institution might prescribe.[3] The school was established in a house which with two acres of ground, the gift of Amos Kendall, adjoined the bounds of the city at 7th and M streets northeast.

---

[1] Joint Resolution, May 18, 1854, and Resolution, Jan. 10, 1854.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, p. 1715, April 13, 1860.

[3] Ordinance, Dec. 10, 1856.

[4] Stats., 12, 4, May 9, 1860. For the discussion see *Congressional Globe*, p. 847, Feb. 21, 1860 and following. For city council action see Ordinance, Sept. 3, 1859, and Joint Resolution, Feb. 4, 1860.

It will be noted that both the insane asylum and the deaf, dumb and blind institution were national as well as local in their scope. It was not the first recognition in this form of the city as a national centre, as more than a quarter of a century before a penitentiary was established on the same basis. While the latter served mainly local purposes, the other two soon were caring for those who came from all parts of the country.[4] A strong force behind these measures was undoubtedly the need of the District, not merely as a local community, but as a national centre. In enacting them, congress reaffirmed its responsibility in the care of the dependent classes of the city, which it first assumed in the year 1841, when an appropriation was made to pay for the maintenance of the District pauper insane in an asylum in Baltimore.[1] For forty-one years congress had given no assistance to the city in enabling it to meet, what had been from the beginning a large annual demand upon its resources, the care of the poor; due, to a large extent, as had been pointed out, not to the condition found in the average community, but to the inflow into the city of paupers and vagrants from other places, and of those others drawn there by real or imaginary business with the government, and gradually sinking into a dependent state. The records of the poorhouse furnished the evidence of their condition as well as the experience of members of congress and of citizens.[2] While the corporation did so much for poor relief that street and other improvements were cut down, the disturbing and mortifying fact was recognized that what was done fell far short of the needs. There was no hospital in the city, and never had been, except the Naval Hospital and the poorhouse infirmary, and no place for the indigent insane except the jail. At length, in 1835, a persistent campaign was begun by the board of health to induce congress to provide a hospital. The city council and the grand jury joined in the movement.[3] But it was not to be on a contracted scale. Its promoters looked beyond merely the needs of a local community, and attempted to provide for the actual demands. In addition to supplying a general hospital for the city, congress was asked to provide a place where the insane could be cared for, as well as sick, disabled, and infirm soldiers and seamen, and others whom competent authority might send to such a hospital.[4] The great scope of this bill, which was only in part filled out some fourteen years later, when congress established the insane asylum and the soldiers' home, it may be concluded, was designed to avoid the objection that only local purposes would be served. At that time the bill passed the senate, went over to the next congress and then was lost sight of.[1] What was termed in 1841 "a temporary provision," for the District indigent insane proved to be of quite a different character, as it was continued each year for some fourteen years, or until the doors of the government insane hospital were opened. By adopting such a policy congress led the country in the movement for a more humane treatment of this unfortunate class. In the course of a few weeks after this change had been provided for in the District, by a strange coincidence, Dorothea L. Dix started upon her investigation in Massachusetts of the treatment of this class, which was continued in other states, resulting in marked improvement in existing conditions.[2]

---

[1] Stats., 10, 92, Aug. 31, 1852; 55th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 185, July 21, 1897, Part 3, p. 14.

[2] Stats., 9, 595, March 3, 1851; also 55th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 185, July 21, 1897, Part 3, p. 37.

[3] Stats., 11, 161, Feb. 16, 1857; 55th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 185, July 21, 1897, Part 3, p. 21.

[4] Eighteen years after the first prisoner was received in the penitentiary, of the 40 convicts then within its walls only 3 were serving sentences imposed by United States courts. 30th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 140, March 2, 1849.

---

[1] Stats., 5, 427, March 3, 1841.

[2] The figures for one year give the relative condition for the entire period. In 1837 (*Intelligencer*, June 29, Mayor's message) only 24 per cent of those cared for in the infirmary and only 40 per cent of the inmates of the poorhouse belonged to the District. See also same, July 29, 1840, and subsequent messages of Mayor Seaton.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 29, 1837, Nov. 20, 1838, and Jan. 31, 1840.

[4] The same, Jan. 6, 1837.

The advocates of a city hospital were not discouraged by lack of success in getting congress to act. At the session following the one when the first appropriation was made for the care of the insane, provision was made by congress for refitting the old jail building in Judiciary Square for that purpose.[3] A few weeks later the inmates of the old jail were removed to the new building at the corner of 4th and G streets, in Judiciary Square.[4] President Tyler, to whom had been intrusted the supervision of the proposed changes, visited the building and made a personal inspection of what was to be done.[5] As the work of adapting the jail for a hospital neared completion, the president appointed Drs. Thomas Miller, Harvey Lindsly and John M. Thomas, all members of the medical faculty of Columbian College, physicians in charge.[6] The building and the medical staff were provided, but that was as far as the establishment of a general hospital in the city of Washington, under the direction of congress, went. A year later, at the request of the medical faculty of Columbian College, the building was placed in its charge, the medical school was removed there and a hospital opened.[1] While the scope of the hospital, as given in the bill providing for refitting the jail for its use, was exactly the same as that of the first measure laid before congress, namely, a general hospital, yet the current idea appeared to be that it was to be principally for the care of the insane.[2] Apparently congress had that object largely in mind. But it stopped short of founding a government-supported institution, because the building and location were looked upon as unsuited for such a purpose.[3] But even with free quarters, the hospital did not at first pay expenses,[4] which, in the main, was attributed to the number of charity cases. An effort was made to secure popular subscriptions, and as a means to that end, a board of visitors was appointed, consisting of the mayor and a representative from each ward. To the city council the advantage of using the city hospital instead of the poorhouse infirmary was pointed out, as the latter was two miles from the centre of the city. At the hospital, however, "the instant the resident student hears of an accident, he takes a proper litter and has the sufferer removed to the hospital."[5] The appeal, however, was without results. By the end of the second year a dispensary was added for the treatment of the poor, and the hospital was placed in charge of Sisters of Charity.[6]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 20, 1838.

[2] Some eight years later Miss Dix was in Washington, furthering a grant of public land to provide a fund in each state for the care of the indigent insane when the government hospital for the insane was created, and it is her claim that she wrote the first draft of the bill. 55th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 185, July 21, 1897, Part 3, p. 14.

[3] Stats., 5, 537, Aug. 29, 1842.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 17, 1842.

[5] The same, Sept. 12, 1842.

[6] The same, April 3, 1843.

---

[1] Stats., 5, 672, June 15, 1844. Toner's Anniversary Oration, p. 55. Also *Intelligencer*, Nov. 2, 1844. In the *Intelligencer* of July 30, 1844, the announcement is made that Drs. Thomas Sewall, Harvey Lindsly, Thomas Miller, John M. Thomas and William P. Johnston, members of the faculty, will visit the hospital daily.

[2] See notices in the *Intelligencer* of Sept. 12, Oct. 3, 1842, and April 3, 1843, where it is spoken of as the lunatic hospital.

[3] Washington Directory for 1843. Note, p. 51. Busey's Personal Reminiscences, p. 214.

[4] *Intelligencer*, May 26, 1845, and Aug. 14, 1846.

[5] The same, Sept. 2, 1844.

[6] The same, Aug. 14, 1846. Apparently the dispensary, the successor of the one started in the Medical College building a short time before the removal to the Judiciary Square hospital (*Intelligencer*, Sept.

The first four years of the hospital were a period of straitened circumstances, as the only source of revenue was the fees of patients. Then congress adopted a method of coöperation, which was continued as long as the hospital existed, and which has remained a feature of District charities. An annual appropriation was made for the support of a certain number of transient paupers.[1] Five years later the building was enlarged through an appropriation by congress, so as to provide more rooms for pauper patients.[2] Included in the changes made in the building at that time a lecture-room was provided for the medical school. While the appropriation for the hospital was pending, the action of the city council showed that the community was not entirely friendly to the hospital management, as a joint resolution was adopted, asking congress to grant the use of the hospital building to the public schools, where a high school could be opened, "as the grant of the property for the purpose of an infirmary has been misapplied by its application, to a great extent, for the purposes of a medical college." [3] Members of the medical profession were also dissatisfied with a policy which closed the hospital to doctors, unless they belonged to the one medical school.[4] However, the management of the hospital was unchanged when, in 1862, the building was occupied by the government as an army hospital, and the Washington Infirmary went out of existence.

By the year 1857, when the first appropriation was made by congress for the care of the deaf, dumb and blind of the Dis-

---

13, 1843), was not continued many years, as some twelve years later, when the homœopathic physicians, then known as the New School, made an effort to start a dispensary, it was stated that such an institution "had long been wanted and it ought to have been done by the other school." *The Star*, Nov. 10, 1858.

[1] Stats., 9, 275, Aug. 12, 1848.

[2] Stats., 10, 199, March 3, 1853. At the opening of the war, shortly before it was destroyed by fire, the building was three stories high, of L shape, with an extension in the rear at right angles to the centre. The capacity was 200 patients. *The Star*, Aug. 14, 1861.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 24, 1853.

[4] Busey's Personal Reminiscences, p. 215. The medical department of Georgetown College was opened in 1851. *The Star*, May 12, 1851.

trict at the Columbia Institution, congress was contributing to the care of four dependent classes, namely, the insane, transient paupers, the deaf and dumb and the blind. When a change was made in 1844, in the location of the poor and the work houses, the use of the hospital reservation, on the eastern border of the city, was secured through the president of the United States. Then the corporation made a subdivision of the old site, and the proceeds of the sale of the lots were used to pay for erecting the necessary buildings in the new location.[1] While much of what was done in the period just before and just following the opening of the decade of 1850 by congressional legislation made the city better adapted to federal purposes, as well as more desirable as a place of residence, yet the scope of the needs was still broader. It was not enough that the size of public buildings was greatly increased, that a beginning was made in improving and adorning the public grounds, that national institutions were established and that a water-supply and street improvements were provided. The city must be made more accessible. At that time, as had been the case for a little more than a decade, Washington was joined to the north by rail, while with the exception of forty miles between the city and Aquia Creek an all-rail route had been opened to the south.[2]

The two bridges over the Potomac, in 1848, had been free for some fifteen years, but the toll-gatherer barred the city approach from beyond the Eastern Branch. All who came to the District limits along the main road, from the north through Bladensburg, were halted, while the turnpike fee was paid, and the same experience was met at the turnpike at the head of the 7th Street Road, now Georgia Avenue, and at the one that formed a continuation of the principal approach to

---

[1] Ordinance, May 10, 1843. Mayor's message. In Laws, 1844.

[2] Five years after the rails had been laid between Richmond and Fredericksburg a nine-mile extension was built to Aquia Creek, thus doing away with the last section of the old-time stage line between Washington and the south. At this time also an ice-boat was secured, so as to insure an open river during the winter. *Intelligencer*, Nov. 14, 1842.

Georgetown by Wisconsin Avenue. To make use of the two highways at the southern end of the Long Bridge — one to Alexandria and the other west to a junction with the turnpike from Alexandria via Fairfax to the northwest — a toll was required. Means of communication, thus burdened, were recognized at this period as inadequate, as is quite evident from the efforts made to improve them.

Congress was appealed to for aid. But these appeals were in vain, as was the case when the turnpikes were first made, and as it proved later on when assistance was asked in providing railroads in and about the city. In this particular congress did not come up to the measure of the expectations of District citizens, who looked to their legislature, as in that period the people of the states were accustomed to do, for aid in all internal improvements. What was done in improving access to the city, by means of turnpikes and railroads, was the result of money contributed by the legislatures of Maryland and Virginia, within their state bounds, and by the District towns and individuals.

But congress did not class bridges with turnpikes or railways. As it had done fifteen years before with the Potomac Bridge, so at this time the two Eastern Branch bridges were purchased and made free.[1] In one respect the result of making the bridges free was disappointing, as the tobacco trade did not revive when the bridge tolls, declared to be too heavy a burden upon it, were removed.[2] The tobacco house on 3d Street between M and N streets southwest, owned by the city, fell into disuse. Ten years later the building had been so long unused that few persons knew where it was located.[3]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 8 and 13, 1848. The bridges were the Anacostia or Bennings (*Intelligencer*, Sept. 1, 1845), approached by a road starting at Maryland Avenue and 15th Street northeast, and the Navy Yard Bridge at the foot of 11th Street. The Eastern Branch Bridge at the foot of Kentucky Avenue had been burned some two years before, catching fire from sparks from a steamboat. Grand Celebration of the Opening of the New Bridge [at the foot of Pennsylvania Avenue], p. 12. Washington, 1890.

[2] Message of Mayor, p. 224. In Laws, 1841.

[3] *The Star*, Jan. 26, 1859. In Georgetown the state of the tobacco trade may be judged by the ordinance of May 25, 1850, directing the

It was probably not generally recognized then that Washington's declining tobacco trade was due more to general than to local causes, and naturally the removing of tolls on the Eastern Branch bridges could not revive the cultivation of a crop that had left the mark of its one-time supremacy throughout this region in fields of exhausted soil. What was of vastly more importance was that the large proportion of market supplies came into the city from Virginia and not from Maryland.[1] That this condition was realized at this time may be concluded by the granting by the Maryland legislature of a charter to build a plank road from the District bounds, at the head of Georgia Avenue, to tap the agricultural region to the north some twenty-two miles to Brookville, Md., and thence to the line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, as well as a road to the great western turnpike at Frederick through Rockville.[2] The section of this proposed new highway within the District had been made into a turnpike road twenty years before, and was then in a bad condition, and so the city council, disregarding the course of congress in the past in regard to turnpikes, asked that body for money to extend over the District section the plank road which the Maryland Co. planned to build.[3] Congress paid no attention to this request, and was equally indifferent to a subsequent plan favored by the city council, that an appropriation be made to buy the Georgia Avenue turnpike as well as the one from the city bounds to Bladensburg.[4] Congress having failed to respond, the turnpike company owning the Georgia Avenue road undertook the improvement, and by the issue of stock, in a year's time built the nearly five miles of plank road.[5] While

---

sale of the tobacco warehouse on the south side of M Street, a short distance west of Wisconsin Avenue.

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 15, 1852.

[2] The same, June 16, 1851.

[3] Joint Resolution of City Council, Aug. 23, 1850.

[4] The same, Jan. 18, 1851.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 9, 1851, and Oct. 15, 1852. The president of the Washington and Rockville Co., as it was named, was B. Ogle Tayloe, and the secretary, John Carroll Brent. (*Intelligencer*, Oct. 22, 1852.) The roadway, covered with hemlock plank three to four inches thick, had a width of eight feet from the head of 7th Street to the District line.

this work of improvement was under way, an effort was made by Georgetown citizens, which proved fruitless, to secure subscriptions to build a plank road between Georgetown and Fairfax Court House.[1] Such a road, if built, would have been under the disadvantage of ending at a ferry opposite Georgetown, while a short distance to the south a pike from Fairfax Court House ended at the free Long Bridge via the Columbia Pike. To the north the Virginia roads led to another free bridge, the one at the Little Falls, but that was two and one-half miles from Georgetown. The condition of communication between the District and Virginia along the upper Potomac, that was sought to be remedied after so many years, as well as the failure to do anything, makes it possible to realize what a barrier the river must have been. As will be noted, the river, by reason of its width, making bridge building costly, had also a wide-reaching influence on the course and progress of railroad building.

Toll roads, even of the limited length of those leading out of the city, were only fairly profitable, for when, in 1858, another attempt was made to induce congress to buy them, the price asked by the companies was a sum on which their earnings yielded six per cent.[2] A suggestion of the financial strength of the Columbia Turnpike Co., Dr. William Gunton, president, which for some years had given up the 7th Street Road pike and was operating the one from the Long Bridge and the one to Bladensburg, is to be found in the purchase of the ferry-boat that ran from the Virginia shore presumably when the Long Bridge was out of commission.[3] A few months prior to the day in the fall of 1852 that the 7th Street plank road was ready for use, a number of citizens made the first trip over a section of the Orange and Alexandria Railroad that had been completed to Manassas, twenty-five miles southwest of Alexandria. At that point the Manassas Gap Railroad Co.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 31, 1852.

[2] 35th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 410, May 24, 1858. The gas company paid ten per cent, while the rate on municipal loans was six per cent.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 22 and Nov. 15, 1852.

had started a line, which then reached the Plains twenty-five miles to the west. The guests of the companies on that occasion went over the entire route, the Manassas road being regarded as a branch of the Orange and Alexandria.[1] This first railway connection of Alexandria with the outer world, seventeen years after the Baltimore and Ohio entered Washington, was begun some ten years after the failure to induce congress to aid in the building of a line that was to fill up the gap in the railroad connection with the south by joining the Nation's capital to Fredericksburg, at that time the northern terminus of the southern line. The selection of the route shows the purpose of the promoters was to provide the most direct connection, as the shortest line was chosen without taking into consideration the chances of getting local business. Then the road was to be built through sparsely settled and poor land near the river. Now the corporation and citizens of Alexandria, aided by the state legislature, subscribed money to build the Orange and Alexandria Railroad,[2] penetrating an agricultural country dotted with towns and making a connection at Gordonsville, ninety miles from Alexandria, with the Virginia Central Railway, that extended east to a point on the railway midway between Richmond and Fredericksburg. For through southern rail travel the new route was more circuitous than the proposed river line. But it made a stronger appeal to investors as the money was secured to make a beginning. The new enterprise had the advantage of being a part of a rather comprehensive plan that was attempted to be carried out, and which was designed to supply railroad facilities in the interior portion of the state. At the session following the one when a charter was granted the Orange and Alexandria Co., the Manassas Gap Railroad Co. was authorized to construct a line west from Manassas, on the Orange and Alexandria Road, through the gap in the Blue Ridge, to Strasburg in the Shenandoah Valley and on to Harrisonburg.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 18, 1852. Also History of the Legal Development of the Railroad System of the Southern Railway Co., p. 532.

[2] Incorporated by the Virginia legislature, March 27, 1848.

The state gave aid as well as a charter to the Orange Road,[1] and also assigned to the company the state's claim to $120,000, which it was held the state had advanced, not granted, to the government to aid in the establishment of the national capital. As a condition of receiving this money, the company was to issue stock of an equal amount for the use of the primary schools of the state. This condition did not deter the company, as the money was needed, and so an application was made to congress, but without result.[2] A year before what may be called the opening of the road, in 1852, the first car-load of flour brought to Alexandria by rail was received from Prince William County, which adjoins Fairfax County, on the west.[3] The railroad was largely an Alexandria enterprise, and that town was the northern terminus. The charter had no provision for an extension to the north, and its projectors did not look forward, as those who planned the Alexandria and Falmouth Road, to continuing the line to Washington.[4] The purpose was to supply a market for southern and western Virginia at the port of Alexandria. For while the new line completed for the first time an all-rail southern connection, yet that was apparently not considered as of much consequence. The existing facilities were evidently regarded as adequate. For the steam-engine for the past decade had replaced the stage-coach on the eight miles of the great southern highway, from Fredericksburg to Aquia Creek, and a steamboat carrying the mail completed the line to Washington.[5] However, the Washington authorities naturally regarded the gap in the railroad connection between Alexandria and the capital city as important. A committee was appointed to confer with the directors of the Orange Railroad in regard to asking the Virginia legislature for the right to extend to the District line at the Long Bridge.[1] The Virginia Co. was hindered, as was the case in railroad building of that period, by the want of money, and it was not until four years after the road was chartered that Gordonsville was reached, where the southern rail connection was made.[2] The company saw an opportunity in Washington's ambition, and proposed that if $600,000 of stock be taken, then one-sixth of the proceeds would be used in building a line from Alexandria to Washington, while the balance would go towards an extension from Gordonsville south to Lynchburg.[3] Perhaps both in the terms offered as well as in the abandonment of further negotiations may be traced evidences of the old-time rivalry and jealousy. The following year the Virginia legislature created an entirely distinct company to construct the seven miles that would, in that period of detached roads, complete an all-rail route from the south to the Virginia boundary of the District.[4]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 18, 1852.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, 31st Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1673, Aug. 27, 1850.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 24, 1851.

[4] The same, Feb. 17, 1840.

[5] The same, Nov. 14, 1842. Some ten days before the railroad connection with Aquia Creek was finished the Baltimore and Ohio was completed as far as Hancock, Md., 228 miles from Baltimore. *Intelligencer*, Nov. 7, 1842.

But the northern end of the line the promoters had in mind was the railroad depot in Washington, and in order to reach it, the broad surface of the Potomac must be crossed, which presumably explains the capitalization of $300,000. However, when an application was made to congress for authority to continue their chartered privileges into the District, the use of the government structure, the Long Bridge, was asked, but only as a temporary expedient, as it was proposed to build a bridge either on the piers of the aqueduct or above it. As to this intention, the Georgetown authorities were decidedly sceptical, and informed congress that it was "an insidious scheme on the part of our neighbors and rivals to perpetuate an oppression which our people have condemned for nearly fifty years."[5] What Georgetown feared was that the temporary use of the bridge would be in reality permanent. In accordance with their time-honored contention, they were opposed to any recognition of either the justice or the feasibility of the retention of that structure.

---

[1] Resolution of City Council, Nov. 27, 1852.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, pp. 1334 and 1742, May 30, 1854.

[3] *Intelligencer*, May 16, 1853.

[4] The same, March 13, 1854. Charter granted to the Alexandria and Washington Railroad Co.

[5] 33d Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 68, June 22, 1854.

The new enterprise met further opposition in congress, as the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co. wanted to build a southern connection. It asked for the right to extend its line through the District, crossing the Eastern Branch by a bridge in order to reach a point on the Potomac opposite Alexandria, where the steamboats from the railroad terminus at Aquia Creek could land, instead of coming to the city, and also where a connection might be made with the railroad, ending in Alexandria, by means of a ferry service.[1] Congress gave both companies what they asked,[2] with the important exception that the Alexandria Railroad was not given the right to lay its tracks on the Long Bridge, or in its course through the city to occupy Pennsylvania Avenue.[3] The entire collapse of the city's hopes, in regard to both the city canal and the western canal, had not then come. So with sanguine expectations the city made its third large venture in internal improvements, by guaranteeing $60,000 of the bonds of the company, a procedure which a committee of the council, nearly a decade later, declared was a violation of the charter of 1848, that forbade an increase in the funded debt of the city without the consent of the people.[4] While the city in this transaction only became the indorser of the railroad company, yet it was compelled for a number of years to shoulder the debt. The city council at that time exercised the right which congress had conferred of designating the route within the city, in case a way was found to cross the river.[5] But in providing for a single track from the bridge along Maryland Avenue to 1st Street, and thence across Pennsylvania Avenue to New Jersey Avenue and the depot, as a committee of congress declared,[1] the city council without authority had allowed the use of Pennsylvania Avenue. Congress took no action. Apparently it was thought by the railroad interests that the Pennsylvania Avenue restriction would be removed when the main privilege was secured and the use of the bridge was authorized. Such hopes were not realized, as the consent of congress was not given to the railroad occupation of the bridge. The course of congress in regard to Pennsylvania Avenue was not due merely to the feeling of the passing moment. At the outset, upon the coming into the city of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, while it is true that the preservation of Pennsylvania Avenue from railroad occupation was not directly provided for in the law of 1835, yet that was its effect. It was not long before a positive sentiment appeared, which was recognized as such in 1847, some seven years before the advent of the Alexandria and Washington Railroad Co., in consideration of plans for making the connection with the south. Then it was stipulated that it should be done without encroaching upon the avenue. At that time it was proposed that the cars pass from the depot through a tunnel under Capitol Hill, east of the capitol,[2] which became a feature of plans proposed in subsequent years.[3] No objection was made to the use of streets east of the capitol or north of Massachusetts Avenue, the suburbs of the city of the period before the civil war.[4] Some four years after the city connection of the Alexandria Road had been authorized by congress, when a proposed steam road, the

---

[1] *Congressional Globe*, p. 1833, July 21, 1854. A few years later the apprehension was felt that not only would the southern steamship landing be taken from the city, but also the through travel in the event, as was proposed, the Baltimore and Ohio built a line from Bladensburg to a point opposite Alexandria. *The Star*, Nov. 10, 1859.

[2] The Baltimore and Ohio did not attempt to use this franchise, but continued to be a figure in the struggle for a southern connection via the Long Bridge, the aqueduct piers, a water terminus on the Eastern Branch or the Potomac. *The Star*, Jan. 22 and Feb. 12, 1859.

[3] Stats., 10, 810, Aug. 3, 1854.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 12, 1863.

[5] City Ordinance, Feb. 8 and July 27, 1855.

---

[1] 34th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 136, April 16, 1856.

[2] 24th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 50, Jan. 1, 1847.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 12, 1851, and Oct. 22, 1853; *The Star*, Feb. 12, 1857.

[4] *Intelligencer*, May 29, 1846, July 23, 1847. Massachusetts Avenue was at that time entirely uninhabited except a small settlement near its juncture with K Street. Nearly a decade passed before an attempt, only partially successful, was made to open and grade the avenue from 12th Street to Florida Avenue. (City Council Resolution, Aug. 20, 1855.) Two years before, Connecticut Avenue was graded from L Street to Rhode Island Avenue. (Ordinance, July 2, 1853.)

Metropolitan Railroad Co., wanted to make use of the avenue to connect the terminus at Georgetown with the Baltimore and Ohio depot, consent was refused. At that time it was asserted that Pennsylvania Avenue was regarded as the most beautiful feature of the city, and must be preserved intact.[1] In anticipation, however, of favorable action, the Alexandria and Washington Co. at once laid tracks from the depot to the bridge,[2] and by the following year the Virginia section was completed and in operation from Alexandria to the bridge.[3] In less than two years the company defaulted on the interest on the bonds, and that burden fell on the city.[4] The operation of the road in Virginia was continued, but it was not until the opening of the second year of the civil war that the tracks in the city were used, and cars run from the depot to Alexandria. At that time the government, under the pressure of military necessity, placed rails on the Long Bridge, thus connecting the sections that had always been separated by the bridge, and operated the entire route as a military road.[5] In extending to the railroad company the credit of the city, the Washington corporation only followed what was a common practice of that period, and as it had done twenty years before, and with the consent of congress to help in the building of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. Georgetown pursued a more prudent course, for instead of borrowing the money voted for the Metropolitan Railroad, a special tax of 10 cents was imposed.[6] What was done by corporate means to help railroad enterprises was felt to be demanded by the vital interests of the community. For while railroad building was going on all about the District, Washington and Georgetown were far behind in such facilities.[7]

What was needed was the building of comparatively short lines that would link up the District with existing lines to the southwest, west and northwest. For at that time Washington had a direct connection with the north through Baltimore, and in a roundabout way, by the Baltimore and Ohio main line at Relay, eight miles from Baltimore, with the west, while Alexandria had tapped the Shenandoah Valley, and also had become the terminus, but not by the most direct route, of the all-rail travel from the south. Then it was determined that some of the growing traffic from the Maryland coal regions and the great west be brought directly to the District towns, especially Georgetown, as it was pointed out that both Baltimore and Alexandria were increasing their trade by railroad communication.[1] Two lines were proposed to connect Georgetown with the Baltimore and Ohio at points east and west of Cumberland, about eighty miles apart.[2] The state of Virginia voted money to help build the Loudoun and Hampshire Road, just as it had for the Orange Road. In the course of six years the tracks had only reached Leesburg, Va., thirty-six miles northwest from Alexandria.[3] As for the road on the Maryland side of the river, the Metropolitan, a section of it was graded and nothing further was done.[4] From the outset the Baltimore and Ohio was opposed to the new Maryland line that was to tap its road and take away a portion of the business which it had secured after many years of railroad building. To its influence was attributed the failure of the Maryland legislature to grant the

---

[1] *Congressional Globe*, p. 864, Feb. 7, 1859.

[2] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 368, 1855.

[3] The same, p. 373, 1856.

[4] City Council Resolution, Jan. 13, 1859.

[5] *The Star*, Feb. 8, 1862.

[6] Stats., 10, 633, March 2, 1855, authorizing the corporation to levy such a tax and Ordinance of May 3, 1856, imposing the tax.

[7] 36th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 565, May 24, 1860, p. 11.

---

[1] *The Star*, May 5, 1854.

[2] The Alexandria, Loudoun and Hampshire Railroad Co. secured a Virginia charter in 1854, and the proposed route was from Alexandria through Leesburg and Winchester to the Baltimore and Ohio, a short distance west of Cumberland, and later on an extension to Georgetown was proposed. The Metropolitan Railroad Co. was chartered by Maryland, May 5, 1853, with a charter from congress for the District section, March 3, 1853, under the name of the Georgetown and Catocton Co. The route was from Georgetown through Rockville to Point of Rocks on the Baltimore and Ohio and thence to Frederick and Hagerstown.

[3] *The Star*, May 17, 1860. The grading for the road-bed was continued in the direction of Winchester. Further progress was checked by the war.

[4] The same, Dec. 17, 1855.

Metropolitan charter at the session preceding the one when it was finally secured.[1] Unlike the Virginia legislature, in the case of the company that built on the south side of the Potomac, the Maryland legislature, beyond granting the charter, gave no aid, the counties through which the road was to pass took no interest, it was found impossible to gain the coöperation of congress, while Washington did not enter very heartily into the enterprise, and even the ambition and zeal of Georgetown, to which its inception was due, began to slacken.[2]

The original purpose was to make Georgetown the terminus, but with the view of engaging the interest of congress and the citizens of Washington, it was proposed, in a memorial sent to congress, to extend the tracks through the section of the city then regarded as the suburbs, by following a route along K Street, Massachusetts Avenue and New Jersey Avenue to the depot, or else through the centre of the city, by way of Pennsylvania Avenue, with also a line to the navy yard.[3] Although the section of the line to Point of Rocks offered the substantial advantage of shortening the travel between the west and the District by some forty-six miles, yet more than a decade and a half passed after the first Metropolitan charter was granted before a road was built, and then it ended in Washington and not in Georgetown.[4]

Until the seventies Washington was approached from the west, not by a direct line from Point of Rocks, which would have been one side of a triangle formed of railroad tracks, but by following the other two sides from Point of Rocks to Relay, eight miles from Baltimore, and thence to Washington. The all-rail route from the south was by a similar but longer course. However, a Potomac steamboat service from Aquia Creek supplied, until some years after the war, the missing railway link in the direct highway between the north and the south.[1]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 14 and March 31, 1852.

[2] Second annual report of the Metropolitan Railroad Co. Georgetown, 1855. At this time the mayor of Georgetown, Henry Addison, by his determined course dealt the enterprise a deadly blow when he vetoed the bill providing for the second payment of $25,000 of the town's subscription of $250,000. Then he was serving his eighth year as mayor, and after four more years he was succeeded by Richard R. Crawford for one term, 1857–1859. Mr. Addison was again placed at the head of the city, serving from 1859 to 1867, coming within three years of the mayoralty service of John Cox, who held the office for twenty-three successive years.

[3] First annual report of the Metropolitan Railroad Co. Georgetown, 1854. Also *The Star*, April 7, 1854.

[4] By U. S. Laws, July 25, 1866, and City Ordinance, Jan. 17, 1867, the franchise was granted to the Baltimore and Ohio, which completed the line in 1873.

It may be concluded these roundabout railroad routes were not looked upon at that time as any serious defect, for when in 1853 the Maryland legislature chartered the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Co. to build a line from Baltimore southwest to a point on the Potomac opposite Aquia Creek, "by which the through traffic would avoid the city [of Washington]," [2] the method proposed of preventing such a result is illustrative of the current notion of direct lines of communication. For it was planned, in order to protect District interests, to build a branch of the Alexandria, Loudoun and Hampshire Railroad, from the vicinity of Falls Church over a bridge, on or near the aqueduct, to Georgetown.[3] As a connecting link between the northern and southern roads, such a section, if it had been built, would have given another detour to an already roundabout railway course.

The expense of bridging such a broad expanse as the Potomac opposite the city was undoubtedly a serious obstacle in the way of railroad enterprise at that period. Freed from such a barrier, it is not probable that nearly three decades would have passed after the whistle of the locomotive was heard in Washington before steam-cars came into the city from the south. It was not until more than half of that period had gone that the Philadelphia city authorities allowed locomotives to cross the Schuylkill River bridge into the city.[1] Even after the Long Bridge came into use in 1862 for railroad purposes, the ferry was the only means of crossing the Susquehanna on the line between New York and Washington. Railroad interests importuned congress in vain for the use of Long Bridge, their efforts, no doubt, weakened by their inability to agree as to which company should enjoy the privilege. The only other alternative was the use of the piers of the aqueduct. For the Alexandria Canal, of which it was a part, had shared the fate of the greater waterway and was a burden to its stockholders.[2] This was the situation soon after the canal was finished, and then it was proposed that the piers be used to support a bridge.[3] It was on the aqueduct piers that, with the help of congress, the Alexandria, Loudoun and Hampshire Railroad Co. was to bring a branch into Georgetown, while the use of that structure was a part of some of the plans for providing the Baltimore and Ohio Co. with a southern connection.[4] The aqueduct early came into use for foot passengers.[5] For a time it was used as a ferry, but this was due to the ingenuity of some boatmen who paid the regular canal tolls, but went no farther than the ends of the aqueduct.[6] The service became so popular that it cut into the business of the Georgetown ferry at the side of the bridge, also the property of the canal company. An appeal to the law was necessary in order to put an end to this unexpected use.[7] In addition to the prominence given the Long Bridge in current affairs by the rivalries of railroad interests, nature helped along the agitation of which this structure was the centre. For when the river rose, the bridge was threatened, and at times yielded to the violence of the flood. On such occasions, and the bridge was swept away three times in the two decades after 1840,[1] Georgetown protested against its restoration, and once brought legal action.[2] Instead of the Long Bridge, a structure, either on the piers of the aqueduct or at the Three Sisters, a short distance above, was favored by Georgetown, but as congress did not furnish the money, nothing was done.[3]

---

[1] Six years after the extension of the railroad from Fredericksburg to Aquia Creek, the boats connecting with Washington had berths and staterooms, "a new feature on our river boats." *Intelligencer*, Oct. 9, 1849.

[2] *The Star*, April 11, 1854. Four years later when what proved to be abortive efforts to build the road were being made, the city council urged congress to erect a bridge near the site of the Long Bridge in order to prevent the expected result of the new line in taking the city off the main route between the north and the south. Resolution of City Council, Dec. 2, 1858.

[3] The Georgetown corporation proposed a subscription nearly as large as that voted for the Metropolitan, providing congress erected the bridge. (Georgetown Ordinance, Aug. 22, 1857.) But congress merely granted a charter. (Stats., 12, 128, Feb. 5, 1861.)

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 21, 1851.

[2] *The Star*, Dec. 2, 1854.

[3] *Intelligencer*, June 2, 1852. As an alternative proposition the erection of a bridge from the foot of E Street to Analostan Island was suggested.

[4] *The Star*, Jan. 30, 1859.

[5] *Intelligencer*, May 28, 1852.

[6] The same, Nov. 22, 1852.

[7] The same, April 22, 1853.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 12, 1840, Aug. 22, 1851, and *The Star*, Feb. 9, 1857.

[2] *Intelligencer*, July 10, 1843.

[3] Report on a suspension bridge across the Potomac by Charles Ellet, Jr. Philadelphia, 1854. The pamphlet entitled A Complaint to the Hon. Albert G. Brown, chairman Senate District Committee, Washington, 1856, contains a discussion of the entire subject from the Georgetown point of view.

CHAPTER XIII

CONGRESS AND PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

It may be concluded that if it had not been for the contention of rival interests, congress would have yielded to the railroad demand in the fifties for the use of the Long Bridge. But on another important phase of the local railroad situation, the occupation of Pennsylvania Avenue, congress adhered with consistency to the position that such use was not in keeping with the dignity and character of a thoroughfare that was even then gaining a national reputation. But entirely outside of the federal consideration for Pennsylvania Avenue, the railroad was objectionable in the built-up portions of the city. For hardly had a decade passed after the steam-cars began running through and across the city streets in the northeast section when the depot at Pennsylvania Avenue and 2d Street was declared to be a nuisance, where the idle gathered, and the character of the locality was so affected that improvements were checked.[1] The depot location was also objectionable, as the tracks leading to it cut off "communication between the parts of the city, and prevented the grading of streets."[2] The company was willing to replace "the mere shed of slight construction designed only for temporary use, a disgrace both to the company and to the city,"[3] providing, however, that it could erect a new structure on the adjoining square to the north, at the northeast corner of 2d and B streets, and not be again disturbed,[4] but was opposed to placing it in "the suburbs,"[5] as the president of the company considered the site at New Jersey Avenue and C Street, just selected by the city council, and which, in fact, was bought by the company for that purpose when the road was first built.[1] The depot site was not the only question at issue between the city and the railroad corporation, for the former had taken up complaints about the high rates for passengers and freight.[2] Again, this was not merely a local question, for the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad Co., operating the line north from Richmond, found the passenger traffic south of Richmond was being diverted from the railway and steamboat service in Virginia to the bay and coasting vessels and thence to Baltimore.[3] This was attributed to the high passenger rate between Washington and Baltimore. In order to convince the Baltimore and Ohio Co. that its charges were too high, the Virginia Co. started two lines of stages between Washington and Baltimore, and in the course of a few weeks added a third. As the fare was about one-half of that of the railroad tariff, the tide of southern travel again passed through Washington. Then the first reduction in the Baltimore and Ohio rates was made, and the stage lines were withdrawn.[4] From the comments in the annual reports to the stockholders by the president of the company, it is apparent the practical method of the Virginia Co. was more disturbing than that adopted by the city council, which, however, made use of its only weapon for railway regulation. It then proposed to exercise for the first time the authority conferred by congress in one of the early Baltimore and Ohio measures enacted some ten years before,[5] and prohibit the use of steam-cars within the city bounds.[6] As it proved, the city authorities were not called upon to make good this threat, any more than the Virginia Co. was obliged to continue its stage competition. For the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co. began to make reductions in its rates, so that in eight years, by gradual changes, they fell from over $2.50 to $1.25.[1] After this adjustment of the rate situation the city still had on its hands the depot site controversy as well as the refusal of the company to submit to taxation by the city in any form. On the other hand, the company wanted a definite settlement in regard to steam-drawn cars within the city. An agreement was reached on both of these issues, but only after five years,[2] and not until the city council again threatened to drive the steam-engine from the city limits. In such an event the president of the road retorted in the last stage of the struggle: the cars will not be horse drawn through the city, but the depot will be removed to the city bounds.[3] But neither party went to extremes. The railroad company could not afford to do so. For what would be the effect on congress if its members were subjected to such an inconvenience? So the company was granted the right to use engines on its line within the city for thirty years. On its part the company, as agreed, erected "a new and handsome building" at the northeast corner of New Jersey Avenue and C Street, the place designated by the city council, its brick stucco exterior ornamented with sandstone. In its appearance the building resembled the Calvert Street depot in Baltimore.[4] In addition to providing the city with money for improving the streets in the vicinity of the depot, by which also an unsightly bog was filled up, the company further agreed to pay the taxes assessed on its real property which had accrued since 1844. In that year the corporation for the first time imposed a personal tax on the railroad by assessing the cars and engines.[1] Then the company not only refused to pay this new tax, but also the realty tax. Now it paid up its back realty tax, but not the personal tax. In addition, it responded to the annual demands of the city collector, although that was not included in the agreement, and in fact it was expressly stipulated in that instrument that the company did not waive its right to contest any future taxation. After four years of taxpaying, the company returned to the former policy and refused to be regarded as a property holder subject to taxation. The attempts of the city to collect a tax were successfully resisted. In 1858 an injunction was obtained by the company. No further effort by the city was made for eighteen years, when the case was brought into the courts and a settlement effected.[2]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 16, 1845.

[2] The same, May 11 and 29, 1846.

[3] The same, Nov. 14, 1846.

[4] The same, June 16, 1845.

[5] The same, June 29, 1849.

---

[1] Joint Resolution of City Council, May 30, 1849.

[2] Ordinance, Sept. 11, 1845.

[3] Eighteenth Annual Report Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co., 1844.

[4] The same. Also report for the following year.

[5] Stats., 4, 268, March 3, 1835.

[6] *Intelligencer*, July 14 and Aug. 26, 1845.

---

[1] Eighteenth and nineteenth Annual Baltimore and Ohio Reports; also *Intelligencer*, July 14, 1845, and Nov. 26, 1853. The reduction on local tickets came first and that on through travel followed when the Maryland legislature gave its permission. The state was a large stockholder, and in addition to fixing the rates, collected an annual tax from the company of one-fifth of the gross passenger receipts on the Washington Branch. Still the net earnings of this section were nearly six per cent on the capital stock. *Intelligencer*, Oct. 16, 1845.

[2] Copy of agreement between the city council and the railroad company, dated June 15, 1850. 57th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 220, p. 64.

[3] *Intelligencer*, June 29, 1849.

[4] The same, Feb. 12 and Aug. 6, 1851. Two years later the railroad property between the old and the new depot sites was offered for sale. *Intelligencer*, Nov. 18, 1853.

The taxing power of the city was denied on the ground of exemption under the charter granted by the Maryland legislature in 1827 and accepted by the act of congress passed four years later, confirming the right to enter the District.[3] But the court held that while the Maryland charter of 1827 exempted the stock of the company, and therefore its property, yet prior to the granting of the District franchise by a supplemental act the Maryland legislature had expressly asserted that nothing in the act shall be construed to do away with the power of taxation. The privileges granted in the District were held to be subject to this reservation. The experience of 1850 in dealing with a railroad company no doubt led the city council, some four years later, in urging upon congress to grant to the Alexandria and Washington Railroad Co. the right to enter the city, to ask, in addition to general supervisory powers, the right of inspecting "the books, papers and correspondence of the company."[1] While congress did not go to that extent, yet the powers given were broad, and included the right of taxation. A few months after the city council had shown what it could do in the way of regulation of the railroad company, attention was turned to correcting the abuses of another form of public service. For just at that time the change had begun which was gradually consolidating the individual interests of the omnibus service. As one means to that end, a sharp competition for business was started, which was intended to drive the weak to the wall, but which also served to intensify the recklessness and disregard for public rights on the part of the drivers. This form of business rivalry was not new. It had been the subject of many complaints, and also of some city legislation, even before 1830, when the omnibus, then just coming into use, took the place of the stage. At this time, as in the early days of the city, the route was still confined to Pennsylvania Avenue, the larger number of omnibuses running between the capitol and Georgetown, and some from the capitol to the navy yard. After the steamboat came into use a branch line to the 11th Street Wharf was added.[2]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 26, 1849.

[2] 3 MacArthur, 122 [1876]. Joint Resolution of Congress, Feb. 1, 1881 (Stats. 21, 516), ratifying the settlement made by the District commissioners for taxes due up to July 1, 1879. Also fifty-fourth annual Baltimore and Ohio Report, Oct. 1, 1880.

[3] *Intelligencer*, June 29, 1849. Letter of Thomas Swann, president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co.

The competition of the earlier period was individual between the drivers of the busses, who were for the most part the owners. When, however, the traffic increased, and the ownership became more concentrated, the methods changed. In addition to the physical struggle for the individual fare, which resulted in fast and reckless driving, collisions and profanity, conditions obnoxious and dangerous to the public,[3] a rate war began. Instead of a levy or $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents, which had been for nearly two decades the current omnibus rate, the fare was reduced by one company to a fip or $6\frac{1}{4}$ cents.[4] The lower rate became general, which naturally made the struggle for business more aggressive and violent. Then the regulative authority of the city council was evoked, and an ordinance was enacted, prohibiting racing, and also designated stands, to put an end to the obstruction of the streets by drivers waiting for a paying load.[1] But the regulation did not regulate.[2] The process of consolidation, as it advanced and centralized the control of the business, had that effect. For about the year 1854 the omnibuses had largely been acquired by one man. The dominant figure was Gilbert Vanderwerken, who had come to the city from New York, some four years before. At first he was associated in partnership with John E. Reeside, who had gone so far along in the direction taken by Mr. Vanderwerken that he had enough vehicles in service to designate them as the Union Line.[3]

---

[1] City Council Resolution, April 6, 1854.

[2] Four years before the outbreak of the civil war the steamboat landing was changed to the foot of 6th Street. *Star*, April 23, 1857.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 26, 1850, and Oct. 11, 1851.

[4] The same, Nov. 16, 1849.

The Georgetown tobacco warehouse on the south side of M Street, a short distance west of Wisconsin Avenue, was purchased from the town by Messrs. Reeside and Vanderwerken, and the buildings were turned into stables.[4]

Then the opposition formed a stock company, the first in this business, and gave it the name of the Citizens' Line. In less than a year, however, a harmony of interests was discovered by these two rivals, and it was announced that an agreement had been made by which the two lines "will be run in regular order, as if all were of the same line." [5] This virtual consolidation carried with it a public advantage, as for the first time the omnibuses were run on a schedule instead of when it was of advantage to the drivers. The public demands were further met by establishing a night service, the busses running from the capitol to Georgetown twice an hour, from 7 to 11.15 P.M.[6] Attention was given to the appearance of the omnibuses, which bore the name of some man of general or local prominence. Painted on the panels on each side were apt to be portraits of the individuals so honored, while the interior panels were adorned with landscapes.[1] Mr. Vanderwerken, as sole proprietor of the Union Line, became the main spirit in the combine, so that when, three years later, capitalists from New York, fresh from the experience of successful street railroad building in that city, asked from congress the franchise for a street railway occupying the omnibus route,[2] at once an understanding was reached with the Washington magnate.[3] The consideration given to his interests indicates, of course, how controlling they were, as well as the current notion that stage lines, when threatened by newer methods, had in some way a species of vested interest which ought to be regarded. There was also the important and practical consideration of appeasing what otherwise would be a hostile influence with legislative bodies. It was this theory of a vested interest that led the Maryland legislature, in 1835, to give to the turnpike company operating a route to be paralleled by the Washington branch of the Baltimore and Ohio Railway, a preference in subscribing for the stock of the company, and also to a provision in the law authorizing the building of a street railway in Philadelphia, directing the purchase of the omnibus line.[4] At first, Washington was not ready for the innovation of street-cars, for only a few years had elapsed since a car line had been built in New York city. Then the ordinary railroad rail was used, which interfered with the general traffic, and on that account created a prejudice against street-cars. Since then a flat, grooved rail, laid flush with the pavement, had come into use. A committee of the city council that went to New York, at the expense of the men applying to congress for the franchise, to see this novel method of transportation, found it of great public convenience and utility.[1] The city council, however, did not accept the judgment of the committee. For in the first place it was decided there was no need for such a change, and then, such a company ought not to be made equal in authority with the city corporation.[2] It was not long before the sentiment in the city council changed as to the need of a street railroad, but its attitude as to municipal regulation, and especially the right to tax, was unaltered.[3] When, four years later, a charter was granted to the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Co., such powers were specifically granted.[4] In fact, the insistence upon such recognition, emphasized, no doubt, by the experience with the Baltimore and Ohio, was one of the factors in what proved to be a prolonged contest in securing a charter from congress.[5] At one stage the suggestion was made, that in place of individual names in the charter that of the city be substituted, but the notion of a municipal corporation building and owning a street railway was said to be novel. Moreover, it was thought, as had been shown in the case of roads and canals, an enterprise that might be profitable to individuals would be a loss to a state or a municipality,[6] and so with this brief reference municipal ownership was dropped. While no allusion was made in the debates of congress to the unfortunate experiment of municipal control of the city canal, yet no doubt that had an influence, as its failure was due as much to defects in plan and in management as to the collapse of the Chesapeake and Ohio canal enterprise. Advanced ideas as to the relation of citizens to public utilities were not confined to the discussions in congress. The writer of a newspaper communication was of the opinion that every citizen ought to have a chance to own stock in the railroad enterprise, and not merely the few who could afford to subscribe to high-priced securities. The shares, he thought, ought to have a par value of $10. It was further suggested that the profits of the Pennsylvania Avenue line ought to be used to pay for lines in less thickly settled sections.[1] An attempt was made to carry out the idea of a people's railroad, and while about $200,000 was subscribed in small amounts,[2] yet it fell short of the estimated cost. It is evident, congress felt at that time that neither the Citizens' Co. nor the Metropolitan Railroad Co., which were classed with "the conflicting interests" that delayed action by congress,[3] would be as likely to succeed in building the road as the third interest, the company which had the backing of moneyed men.[4] The measure did not become a law. At the next congress, and after an interval of two years, the charter was given to an entirely different group of men.[5] To guard against the possibility of speculation in the charter, holding it until it could be sold to advantage, congress gave the company only sixty days to build the line from the capitol to Georgetown, and fixed a brief limit of time for the completion of the 14th and 7th streets and navy-yard sections of the road, under penalty of forfeiture of the charter. The requirement proposed during the consideration given by the previous congress, of a tax of one-half a cent on each passenger, for the

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 21, 1850.

[2] The same, Oct. 11, 1851.

[3] The same, July 24, 1850. A sketch of Mr. Vanderwerken's connection with the business was printed in *The Star* of Feb. 11, 1859, but it is not entirely accurate.

[4] Georgetown Ordinance, May 25, 1850. The price paid for the property was $5000.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 26, 1851.

[6] The same, June 17, 1850.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 28, 1850; *The Star*, March 25, 1857.

[2] *The Star*, Jan. 17, 1854. A similar application from another source had been made two years before, which brought the street railway subject before congress. *Globe*, p. 666, Jan. 29, 1859.

[3] *The Star*, Feb. 3, 1854. The agreement was stated to be to take the whole of his omnibus stock at a price to be appraised by disinterested persons. (*Globe*, p. 670, Jan. 29, 1859.) A section in the bill which subsequently became a law required the company to buy the Vanderwerken line, but it was dropped out. (*Globe*, p. 1471, March 31, 1860.)

[4] *Globe*, p. 2377, May 26, 1858.

---

[1] *The Star*, March 14, 1854.

[2] Resolution of City Council, April 6, 1854.

[3] The same, Dec. 30, 1858.

[4] Stats., 12, 388, May 17, 1862.

[5] *The Star*, Jan. 1, 1859.

[6] *Globe*, p. 2375, May 26, 1858; also *The Star*, Dec. 9, 1858.

[1] *The Star*, Oct. 21, 1859. As indicating how slowly the city spread out it was not until 1860 that a branch line to the old-time omnibus route was provided. Then busses ran on 7th Street as far north as L Street, but "as an experiment." (*The Star*, Feb. 20, 1860.) At that time M Street was spoken of as the limits of the city, and so continued until about 1867.

[2] *Globe*, p. 1471, March 31, 1860.

[3] *The Star*, Nov. 17, 1859.

[4] *Globe*, p. 1468, March 31, 1860. The incorporators favored by the committee were Richard Wallach, George W. Riggs, Walter Lenox, Jonah D. Hoover, James M. Carlisle, W. B. Todd, Charles W. Boteler, George Harrington, John F. Coyle and Walter S. Cox.

[5] Stats., 12, 388, May 17, 1862. The incorporators were Elias Kingman, Franklin Tenney, J. J. Combs, Sayles J. Bowen, Charles H. Upton, Henry Addison and Hallet Kilbourn.

education of the poor of Washington and Georgetown, as well as the one to pay Gilbert Vanderwerken for his real estate, omnibuses and horses, were not a part of the bill which finally became a law. However, this property was purchased, and the owner paid in stock. The fare was fixed at five cents, with transfers.

Two years before the municipal authorities began their efforts to regulate the only two public service agencies besides the gas company, the steam railroad and the omnibus lines, they were called upon to grant the use of the streets to another medium for supplying public needs.[1] More than four years had passed since that day in May, 1844, when Samuel F. B. Morse convinced a world, mostly of sceptics, that he had really invented a practical electric telegraph. For he established beyond doubt that he could send and receive messages over the line between Washington and Baltimore, which had been built with money appropriated by congress in 1843.[2] It was not the first time telegraph messages had been sent from Washington, as two years before, the system of Gonon had been demonstrated on a line built from the capitol to Bladensburg.[3] In 1838 Morse made an attempt to secure the aid of congress, but the prospect was so discouraging that nearly five years passed before he made another attempt. This time the money was voted, and a line was built following the course of the railroad from Washington to Baltimore. The first formal test of the completed line was made in the presence of an interested throng, in the Supreme Court room at the capitol on the 24th of May, 1844. Then some six months were spent in perfecting and improving the operation. By the fall an office was established in a building on the west side of 7th Street between E and F streets, adjoining the city post-office.[4] The next spring congress made another appropriation for the expenses of the line, and placed it under the direction of the postmaster-general. Then the general business of transmitting messages was begun.[1] For nearly a year and a half it was operated by the government, when, in accordance with directions from congress to either lease or sell, it was turned over to Alfred Vail, then in charge of the Washington office, and Henry J. Rogers, in charge of the Baltimore office, who agreed to keep the line in operation until the next spring, which was that of 1847, for its earnings, which, however, proved to be very slight.[2] At the time this arrangement was made to transfer the operation of the line from public to private control, the wire connection between New York and Baltimore had just been completed by a company that had been formed through the efforts of Amos Kendall, who was made president.[3] By the spring of 1847, when the agreement of Messrs. Vail and Rogers ended, the operation of the line, together with its extension to New York, was undertaken by the company, of which both Vail and Rogers were members. At that time, B. B. French, late clerk of the house, and formerly commissioner of public buildings, was president.[4] For more than two years after the telegraph ceased to be operated by the government the telegraph service in the city was confined to the one line. As it was built by direction of congress, the city authorities had not been asked to grant the right of way through the streets. But when the business required additional facilities, a general authority was given by the city council to such use of the streets as the mayor might direct.[5] Four years later, when competitors appeared, then the city authorities were more careful, and specified the exact route of the pole lines, and in addition stipulated that "no poles shall be erected on Pennsylvania Avenue,"[1] but made no further attempt at rate regulation. The municipal control was continued until 1863, when congress transferred to the secretary of the interior authority to grant permits for the erection of telegraph poles, and to approve the route.[2] At the same time, it will be borne in mind that the greater portion of the pole lines within the city were through areas of unoccupied land. As in the earlier period, the development of the city was not uniform. Great stretches of vacant or at least sparsely settled land extended from a short distance north of the main centre, between the capitol and the president's house, to the urban bounds. While beyond, marked by no feature to distinguish it from the land within the city limits, lay the suburbs, with houses scattered here and there, for the most part the homes of those who cultivated the soil or who preferred country life. This condition continued, to a large extent, unchanged until after the civil war, although at an earlier period a beginning was made of a suburban movement. The earliest attempt on any extended scale to make available the farm lands beyond the city limits for residence uses was in the year 1845, when William Holmead announced that he had divided his farm, "including the race course," into lots of five to fifty acres.[3] This broad plateau, bounded by 15th and 16th streets, Florida Avenue and Columbia Road, had been under lease five years before to the National Jockey Club. There, from the opening years of the century, the popular sport of horse-racing had been enjoyed. But for some reason the interest had declined, and when the life of the jockey club expired by limitation, it was not renewed.[1] The race-track then reverted to the owner of the land, William Holmead, who, after making a vain attempt to revive horse-racing, turned the ground into building sites. While the track continued to be used after the Jockey Club disbanded,[2] yet it was only occasionally, and such events had no local place, until some four years before the civil war, when a one-mile course was built at Jackson City.[3] The new place did not revive the dying sport. It may be concluded that in the course of seven or eight years after the old Washington race-course fell into complete disuse, the progress of the suburban movement had caused it to entirely disappear. For then a half-mile track was provided farther to the north. It was known as the Piney Branch course or, as it was called later, the Brightwood track, at 16th and Kennedy streets.[4] The tendency towards the suburbs was not, however, confined in this period to the region immediately north of the bounds of the city. By 1853 so many people were living along the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, whose business required their daily presence in the city, that the railroad company was requested to have the trains stop at way-stations for their accommodation.[5] At that period the heights of Georgetown were spoken of as the summer resort of the fashionables,[6] while a recreation park was opened at the head of 7th Street, near which a hotel was built for the benefit of those who wished to leave the city during the summer.[7] To meet what was evidently regarded as a demand for country houses, a subdivision of suburban property was made, when R. Y. Brent divided a tract north of Florida Avenue, near North Capitol Street, into lots of one and ten acres, and placed it on the market.[8] The subdivision,

---

[1] Joint City Council Resolution, Sept. 25, 1848. Granting permission "to the Western Telegraph Co. to erect posts in the city."

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 27, 28 and 29, 1844.

[3] The same, July 26, 1841.

[4] The same, Oct. 7, 1844. The building was owned by the government. *Intelligencer*, March 18, 1844. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 6, p. 181.

---

[1] 29th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 1, Dec. 2, 1845. Postmaster-general's Report.

[2] 29th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 1, Dec. 8, 1846.

[3] *Intelligencer*, June 9, 1845.

[4] Historical Sketch of the Electric Telegraph. Alex. Jones, New York, 1852. It is not clear that the government received anything for its interest in the line.

[5] Joint Resolution of City Council, Sept. 25, 1848. Ordinances were passed by both the Georgetown and Alexandria councils, giving permission to erect poles as the mayor might direct. In both instances it was stipulated that only the usual rates be charged. Georgetown Ordinances, Nov. 21 and 28, 1846. Alexandria Ordinance, Oct. 23, 1846.

---

[1] Resolution of City Council, Dec. 16, 1852; Ordinances, June 29, 1855, and Nov. 12, 1858.

[2] Stats., 12, 827. Joint Resolution, March 3, 1863. See *The Star* for Sept. 15, 1865, in regard to the complaints about the unsightliness of the streets that "bristle with telegraph poles of the most awkward and unshapely sort."

[3] *Intelligencer*, July 12, 1845. Three years later he stated that "avenues" had been opened through the land and a division made into parcels of four to six acres which were offered "to those wanting country residences." The same, Aug. 14, 1848.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 11, 1839.

[2] The same, July 15, 1851, and Oct. 15, 1852.

[3] *The Star*, July 22, 1857, and July 26, 1858.

[4] The same, Aug. 6 and Oct. 17th, 1859, and July 24 and Sept. 12, 1860.

[5] *Intelligencer*, July 1, 1853.

[6] *The Star*, June 10, 1854.

[7] The same, March 25, 1854.

[8] *Intelligencer*, May 19, 1851.

known as Homestead, apparently did not meet a current demand. Three years later, Amos Kendall, who since his retirement from public life, where he had been a prominent figure in the Jackson administration and subsequently had undertaken the organization of the telegraph business, offered for sale houses on two-acre tracts, which he had built on a street parallel with Florida Avenue, and opened up through his property on the city borders at 7th and M streets northeast.[1]

But Kendall Green, as he named the property, or Kendallville, as it was called, was not destined to be an addition to the city. For three years later he gave one of the houses as a home for the newly incorporated Columbia Institution for the deaf, dumb and blind, and in its growth additional ground was occupied. Before Mr. Kendall determined on this latter use of the property, and with a view to encouraging settlement, a line of omnibuses was established to run twice a day from Pennsylvania Avenue and 7th Street to Kendall Green.[2] The same year the villa sites of Kendall Green were placed on the market, the Union Land association subdivided a farm on the south side of the Eastern Branch, where a settlement called Anacostia was located.[3] By the payment of $3 a month, for twenty-five months, a deed in fee simple could be obtained to a lot 24 × 130 feet.[4] In the course of two months 350 lots, one-half of the number in the subdivision, having been sold, the balance was placed on the market.[5]

---

[1] *The Star*, June 2 and July 12, 1854. Mr. Kendall occupied one of the houses, his son-in-law, William Stickney, another, while the others were offered for sale.

[2] At this time a line ran for a while out 7th Street to the park. *The Star*, July 31, 1854.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 8, 1849. "A new post-office is established at Anacostia to take the place of Good Hope which was discontinued in consequence of the removal of the postmaster." In the course of nine years the office was discontinued, but was reëstablished in 1865 under the name of Uniontown. *The Star*, Dec. 5, 1891, in article, Roadside Sketches.

[4] *The Star*, June 2 and 10, 1854.

[5] The same, July 29, 1854. The promoters of this enterprise were John Fox, John W. Van Hook and John Dodler.

The progress of the settlement, which was described as directly opposite such a centre as the navy yard,[1] may be judged by a notice, six years later, of the dedication "of Ryan's Chapel in Uniontown by Rev. Dr. Ryan, pastor of Ebenezer Methodist Episcopal Church," when it was described as "purely a missionary enterprise, the first and only church in this neighborhood."[2] The suburban development which began in the opening years of the decade of 1850 indicates an expansion of the population. At the same period a new phase was given to what had always been characteristic, namely, the drawing power of the city, which was felt by all classes of the people. It is this which gives significance to a business transaction, when an owner of a steamboat made arrangements with John A. Washington, the owner of Mount Vernon, to establish a regular service between Washington and the home of the first American.[3] No doubt the proportion of the dollar charged for the round trip that went to the owner of Mount Vernon was a welcome addition to what was probably a scanty income from such an estate. At the same time the prospect of the business was sufficiently encouraging to induce the steamboat owner to build a wharf at Mount Vernon. At the outset it was intended to make trips every other week, but in the course of a month four trips were made in one week.[4] Three years later the movement was started by Miss Ann P. Cunningham, which resulted in an agreement made in 1858 for the purchase of the 200 acres of the estate for $200,000 by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association. By the opening of 1860 the money raised by public appeals was secured and the association took possession.[5] In anticipation of the renewed interest on the part of the public, now that the future of this historic spot was assured, the Mount Vernon Turnpike Co. was organized and began the construction of a road between Mount Vernon and Washington. The purpose of building a horse-car line to run daily between those points was announced, but these plans, like many others formed at the threshold of the civil war, were not carried out.[1] The material interests of the city did not alone hold the attention of the community. At the beginning of the decade of 1840 attention began to be called to the condition that seventy-five per cent of the children of school age were not attending school.[2] The only municipal provision for education at that time, as had been the case for more than a third of a century, were two schools, one in the western and one in the eastern section. For nearly twenty years these schools had been open only to the children of those too poor to pay for schooling. Even after the lottery fund became available in 1826, as it was not treated as a supplement to city appropriations, but the entire school expenditure was kept within the income of that fund, the scope of the schools was not broadened or their number increased. In effect, the policy of publicly supported schools for the poor and privately supported schools for those able to pay, an attempt to divide the cost of the education of the rising generation between the municipality and well-to-do parents was not changed. While the scheme appeared to be practicable, yet, in reality, it was not so. For the private schools and the public schools combined enrolled only a small proportion of the children of school age. Before the close of the first decade after the lottery school fund became available, the actual condition was realized. But what was to be done? There was no money to provide additional school buildings, unless city expenditures were cut down or more money was raised by taxation. Apparently, neither course was palatable. So an appeal was made to congress for aid, either in public lands or in money, to enable the corporation

---

[1] The Government Hospital for the Insane in this vicinity was opened the following year with sixty inmates, but apparently its prospects were not regarded as likely to have an influence on real estate values, as no reference was made to it.

[2] *The Star*, June 12, 1860.

[3] The same, Aug. 19, 1850.

[4] The same, Sept. 12, 1850.

[5] The same, March 8, 1860. See also Report of the Virginia Board of Visitors to Mount Vernon. Richmond, 1901.

[1] *The Star*, Jan. 23, 1860.

[2] Resolution of City Council, Aug. 17, 1839. Also report of committee, same year.

to provide a system of education open to all children.[1] This was in 1837, and while congress was again and again asked to recognize the District in the allotment to the states of public lands for school purposes, yet it was never done.[2] With no help from congress, and an inadequate provision by the corporation, citizens again came forward, as they did in the early days of the public schools, with their contributions. They had in mind, however, the correction of but one of the grave defects in the system. A belated realization had come, that with the schools as then conducted, no way was open for girls to gain an education unless they could afford to go to private schools. Very few girls attended the publicly sustained eastern school. They were not allowed to go to the school in the western section of the city because, as it had been decided long before, "of the immoral tendency of mingling a great number of the two sexes together, both in and out of school."[3] To meet such a need, Mrs. Jacob Gideon, a member of the Fourth Presbyterian Church on 9th Street, opened "a female charity school," which she taught. The use of a room on the church property was given. Some of the members of the First Presbyterian Church, on 4½ Street, opened a similar school in the church property. The city council encouraged these charitable efforts, by making an appropriation, from the income of the lottery fund remaining after paying the expenses of the two public schools.[4] But such aid was not continued. Applications came in from churches of other denominations for a share of the public funds for a similar purpose. Apprehension was expressed that the continuance of such a system would result in sectarian education,[5] and this method of eking out the deficiencies of the public school fund was given up. In the meantime, public schools were established in Baltimore,[1] which, of course, had the influence of calling renewed attention of Washington citizens to local defects. But, as was strongly set forth in a report to the city council, in order to provide an adequate school system a tax must be laid of not more than twenty-five cents on all assessable property.[2] However, such a method was opposed, as was the case with all tax increase. At this time emphasis was laid on the injustice of imposing this form of taxation, when, under the existing law, the entire burden would fall upon the owners of real and personal property, while the possessors of stocks and bonds would go free.[3] At the same time, doubt was expressed as to whether the corporation had the power to impose a special tax. Both the inequality as well as the doubt as to corporate powers were renewed by the charter of 1848. Yet nine years passed before an effort was made to lay a special school tax. Then a bill providing for a school tax of ten cents on the dollar was passed by the common council and defeated in the board of aldermen. After an interval of three years, and a few months before Lincoln was elected, another attempt was made, which was successful.[4] As it proved, the financing was the weak place in what was otherwise a progressive and efficient school system, established by the ordinance of Dec. 6, 1844. It is not clear why citizens were reluctant to authorize a school tax. Certainly, it was not because of overtaxation.[5] At the same time, they were willing to go back to the old-time and discredited practice of exacting a tuition fee from all pupils able to pay. It is quite evident that the sole purpose was revenue, for four years later, when a poll-tax was provided and assigned to the use of the schools, then the tuition fee was done away with. Under the school system of 1844 administration was made more effective. Instead of two school boards, one was substituted, composed of three representatives appointed by the city council from each of the four school districts. Two schoolhouses were built, the first use of city money for such a purpose.[1] For at that time the city council began to appropriate from current revenues to supply the deficiencies in the school fund, derived solely from the lottery money and the poll-tax. In the course of a few years this appropriation became one of the largest items in the annual budget, but even then it was but six per cent of the total expenditures.[2] It fell short of the demands made upon it. For this reason but few schoolhouses were built. Instead, rooms and buildings were leased. Although many of the leased rooms were in basements of churches and in buildings unsuited for such uses,[3] the school attendance increased, so that in twenty-four years after the expansion of the system was begun in 1844 the percentage of children not attending school had fallen from about 75 per cent to 47½ per cent.[4] A similar broadening and modernizing of the school system were made in Georgetown, where, up to 1842, pay and free pupils were taught in the same school, managed by an association. Then the management and support of the school were assumed by the town. At first, tuition fees were done away with, but in the course of six years were restored.[1] Georgetown did not have, as Washington had, the income from a special fund, nor indeed did congress authorize a poll-tax for the schools until eight years after it had been given to Washington. While the process of adapting the schools in Washington and in Georgetown to the needs of an increased population was going on, as well as to bring them more in harmony with current ideas as to the duty of the community in regard to public education, the same influences were being felt in the county of Washington, where there had never been public provision for education. By the year 1852 many of the large land-holdings had been divided into small farms, and the population had increased.[2] A movement to secure schools for that section of the District was started. On the 11th of August, 1856, congress passed an elaborate law, which provided a school system similar to that of Washington, with a board of trustees appointed by the levy court, and representing the several districts into which the territory was to be divided. By vote of all the white taxpayers, irrespective of sex, which is the first and only instance of the franchise conferred on the women of the District, a tax of 12½ cents was to be laid on all assessable property for the support of the schools. But the property holders, especially the women, took a narrow, undemocratic view of public schools. So the plan was rejected by a large majority. Eight years passed before public schools were provided in that section of the District.[3] The record of the changes made in the schools in the years following the adoption of the new system is not to be found alone in the increased attendance. For in that time the two charity schools, where detached leaves served for books, had disappeared. Many years were to elapse before the point

---

[1] History of the public schools. In School Report for 1874–1875, p. 39.

[2] In 1852 a procession of 2500 school children, headed by the mayor, members of the city council and board of trustees, marched to the capitol and presented a memorial to congress through members of the two houses, who came out on the east portico to receive it, asking aid for the schools. *Intelligencer*, May 21, 1852.

[3] *Intelligencer*, April 3, 1839.

[4] Ordinance, May 30, 1840. *Intelligencer*, July 29, 1840. Mayor's message. A discourse. John C. Smith, 1855.

[5] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 13 and 20, 1842.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Oct. 20, 1842.

[2] The same, Nov. 11, 1842.

[3] The same, Nov. 14 and June 5, 1842. By the charter of 1848 for the first time this species of property was made taxable.

[4] History of Public Schools. In School Report for 1874–1875, p. 36; Ordinance, July 7, 1860.

[5] In 1830 the per capita tax was about $4, and was unchanged ten years later. In 1850 it was about $2.96 and in 1860 about $5.52. See city receipts and expenditures. In Laws, 1830 and 1840, p. 84, and 1849, p. 221.

---

[1] Under the new system the old Western and Eastern schoolhouses were continued in use, and in the two new districts buildings were erected. One building, two stories in height, was located on the northwest corner of Judiciary Square (5th and G streets) and the other on the east side of 6th Street between D and E streets southwest. School Report in Laws, 1845, p. 217.

[2] In Laws, 1853, p. 202.

[3] *The Star*, Dec. 10, 1858, and Aug. 12, 1859. List of schools and their locations. In city directory for 1853, p. 88; also in Laws, 1855.

[4] The first percentage was based on the census of 1840, which included children from 4 to 16 years, while the latter was the result of a census taken in 1858 by a committee of the Columbian Teachers' Association, when children from 5 to 18 were counted. (Report upon the educational statistics of Washington. Washington, 1858.) The same year a similar census was taken in Georgetown by the school trustees, and it was found that 50 per cent of the children between the ages of 5 and 18 did not attend school. In Washington Public School Report, 1874–1875, p. 76.

---

[1] Special Report Commissioner of Education, 1871, p. 59.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 5, 1852.

[3] Sketch of the County Schools. In School Report for 1874–1875, p. 81.

in the development of public education in the District was reached where books were supplied to all pupils.

The nearest approach to it was based on the old distinction of the rich and the poor, so that when the new school system was established in 1844, provision was made that the children of indigent parents be supplied with books. The following year the teaching of music was made a part of the school curriculum, but was abandoned for lack of means,[1] as was the case with the other proposed features of a more complete school system. While, in 1858, two night schools were started, many years passed before a school superintendent or a high school were provided.

In spite of such deficiencies, as well as the lack of buildings designed for school uses, which was the greatest of them all, the public schools rendered an excellent service, and their efficiency was such that Mayor W. B. Magruder was able to declare, in one of his messages, that they are "now classed with the best private schools in the city." [2] A further suggestion of this equality is to be found the organization of the Columbian Association of Teachers.[3] For unlike the earlier organization,[4] the Teachers Institute, which had for its territory the entire District, its membership was confined to those engaged in teaching in the public and private schools of Washington. For the first year, Joseph Henry, who had come from Princeton College to the city only three years before, and as secretary of the Smithsonian Institution was then engaged in his great work of organizing that institution, served as president. Associated with him were George J. Abbott, who was then just bringing to a close his active career as the principal of the school at the southwest corner of 17th and I streets, Otis C. Wight, then almost at the threshold of his long and useful career as principal of the Rittenhouse Academy on Indiana Avenue between John Marshall Place and 3d Street,[5] and G. F. Morrison, who was then erecting a building at the northeast corner of 14th and K streets, "in a retired and quiet part of the city" for Rugby Academy, of which he was principal.[1] A few blocks to the north, at 14th and N streets, was the building erected by Columbian College, where a preparatory school was established, under the direction of Zalmon Richards.[2] Later on, Mr. Richards erected a building at the northwest corner of 14th Street and New York Avenue, where he opened a school.[3] At that period Charles B. Young was a teacher in Woodbury's Academy, 12th and H streets, but a few years later founded Emerson Institute.[4] Prominent in the councils of the association for many years were John E. Thompson and Strong John Thompson, both successful teachers in the public schools.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 6, 1845.

[2] In Laws, 1856.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 10, 1849, and Jan. 14, 1850.

[4] The same, Jan. 4 and Oct. 30, 1839.

[5] At this period the boys' school at Orange, N. J., under the charge of Rev. Anthony Ten Broeck, had just been removed to the District in an attempt to revive St. Johns Institute, an Episcopal Church

While the public schools, increased in number, were in the general thought of the day freed from all class distinction, and the doors flung open to all, yet in fact the colored people, forming twenty-five per cent of the population of the city, enjoyed none of the benefits.[5] Of this class, the slaves, constituting twenty per cent, were not according to prevailing custom, permitted to be taught, but that was not the case with the free colored. Provision was made for their religious instruction at an early day in Washington, and as their number increased and their circumstances improved, they provided their own churches.[6] The increase in the number of the free

---

school which had been started four years before in a building occupying a portion of the grounds of the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation on Wisconsin Avenue. *Intelligencer*, April 2, 1847. Also Peace Cross Book, p. 62.

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 11, 1851. Circular of Rugby Academy. Washington, 1852.

[2] The same, Sept. 18, 1848.

[3] The same, July 23, 1851.

[4] The same, April 5 and July 21, 1853.

[5] This proportion of the colored population is based on the census figures of 1850. Ten years before the percentage was 28.

[6] By 1854 there were nine places of worship for colored people. (Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 361.) Among these churches were Israel Bethel African Methodist Episcopal, 19th Street Baptist, Little Ebenezer, Asbury, 15th Street Presbyterian, Wesley Zion, Galbraith Chapel, Union Bethel and John Wesley. Special Report of Commissioner of Education, 1871, pp. 196 and 217.

colored was rapid, while, owing in part to the tax on the slaves of non-residents, that class was decreasing with about the same ratio as the increase in the free colored. To the latter was attributed much of the current disorder and crime. Incendiary fires were not in all instances traced to the engine-house gangs, as the free negroes were suspected and also convicted of this crime.[1] The corporation laws for the regulation and control of this class were most stringent, but not their enforcement.[2] Perhaps one explanation of the contradiction of oppressive class laws and a steady increase in that class is found in their importance in the life of the community, as the domestic servants were largely drawn from their ranks.[3] Schools were opened by colored men and women, who themselves had gained what knowledge they possessed only as the result of perseverance and self-denial.[4] Besides the obstacles in the way of education, due to poverty and the slight qualifications of the teachers, the schools encountered the hostility and suspicion of that portion of the community that regarded the colored man as a mere chattel. At times the schoolhouses were burned, and at others the pupils were liable to be attacked on their way to and from the schools. In addition to the schools and churches, secret organizations, like the Masons and Odd Fellows, existed. The Social Lodge of Masons was formed in 1826, and there is also a record of two other lodges before the war period. A lodge of Odd Fellows, the Union Friendship, dates back to 1846.[5] At the same time there was no relaxation, at least in the letter of the law, in the stringent regulations designed to prevent meetings of colored people, and yet it was not until 1860 that a case is mentioned of an application of these laws to such organizations. Then apparently the nine men arrested were "bolters" from existing lodges of colored Masons.[1] But personal liberty laws, with sole reference to this class, had long been in force, and while at times changed, they were still stringent. As is not uncommon, the actual practice is not to be learned from the statute books. For these people, denied civic rights, the object of laws highly restrictive in the ordinary activities of life, still had their churches and schools. They owned property, and many of them were engaged in various gainful pursuits, dependent on the good-will of the community, just as was the case with the white man. Five years before the war, when comment was made in a newspaper article of the change of fashion that resulted in having weddings in churches, it was observed that "the colored population has adopted the fashion of the white folks."[2] Further light is thrown upon the temper of the community. For in the period of aroused feeling just prior to the adoption of the compromise measure of 1850, which was designed to extract from the institution of slavery the poison of sectional misunderstanding and irritation, a notable thing occurred. For then the abolitionists established in Washington a national organ. Without arousing any open hostility in a community where, by law and custom, slavery prevailed, the *National Era*, on the 7th of January, 1847, began its career as a weekly.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 19, 1842. Mayor's Message, Aug. 1, 1842. In Laws, 1842.

[2] An illustration of the scope of the laws as well as of the laxness in their execution is to be found in a resolution of the city council of Jan. 20, 1854, which is almost the only one of the sort authorizing the mayor "to grant a permit to Cassy Butler to give to her friends two suppers on any two evenings during January for the benefit of Bethel Chapel."

[3] *Intelligencer*, Sept. 19, 1842.

[4] An account of some of these schools is to be found in the Special Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1871, p. 195.

[5] The 20th Century Union League Directory. Washington, 1901.

It is true, that when Benjamin Lundy established the first antislavery paper issued in Washington, no one interfered with him. But fifteen years had passed, and in that time the slavery issue had become tense and ominous. Now a press had been set up that was regarded as a party rather than a personal enterprise. Then, too, it was notorious that the editor, Dr. Gamaliel Bailey, a few years before, had twice seen the office of an antislavery paper, of which he was the editor, destroyed by a Cincinnati mob. No doubt it was also a matter of common knowledge that John G. Whittier, the Quaker Poet, as he came to be called, and the corresponding editor of the new paper, had met with a similar experience in Philadelphia some eight years before. It is not surprising that the atmosphere was found by the editor and his family at first to be rather chilly in Washington.[1] After a time this wore off, for it soon became evident that the new paper did not belong to the radical wing of the abolition party. The pen of the editor was not dipped in gall, and did not create the irritation that Garrison produced.[2] As announced in the first number of the *Era*, the leading purpose was the discussion of the question of slavery and the advocacy of the main principles of the Liberty Party, that had separated from the section of the abolitionists led by Garrison, and had, in 1844, nominated James G. Birney for the presidency. The editor, however, declared that he favored the abolition of slavery, although he wanted it done in accordance with the constitution and the laws, so that the fact remained that his mission was to attack a property interest of the community, or what was perhaps of more consequence in this period of lessened slaveholdings in Washington, the interests of the slaveholding class. The significance of establishing at the Nation's capital an abolition organ was recognized, as a few months later it was proposed to publish in Washington a paper with a distinctive southern policy. But this plan came to nothing.[3] Then the burning question of the day showed another phase, when, in the summer of 1847, a small group of people decided to organize a Congregational Church. At that period the denomination was as completely unrepresented in the south as the antislavery press, and for much the same reason. The project was therefore radical. It was not merely proposed to take the name of the denomination, but also to adopt the Cambridge platform, which included an antislavery plank.[1] For some months services were held, and finally a council was called to formally organize a church, but owing to the lack of agreement among those who proposed to constitute the church, it was not deemed expedient to proceed, and so the project was abandoned. As it proved, the church enterprise failed because of internal and not external opposition, although the latter might have been expected. As the disagreement was mainly on the subject of slavery, the course of this church effort furnishes an illustration of the unsettled state of mind, as to what ought to be done, even among those opposed to slavery.

---

[1] *The Star*, Feb. 9, 1860.

[2] The same, Nov. 3, 1855.

---

[1] Mrs. Bailey told Gail Hamilton some years later that during the first six months of their residence in Washington only one lady called on her. Gail Hamilton's Life in Letters, p. 176.

[2] All the space was not given up to the slavery issue, as purely literary contributions were welcomed. In addition to Mr. Whittier, Grace Greenwood and Gail Hamilton wrote regularly. Mrs. Emma D. E. N. Southworth, a teacher in the public schools of Washington, and a prolific writer of stories, was an early contributor.

[3] *National Era*, Aug. 26, 1847.

In another particular this attempt to establish a congregational church is of interest, on account of its connection as an occupant with the building on the west side of 8th Street, between H and I streets, which had been erected a year previous for the Central Presbyterian Church that had but a short existence. Its first pastor was Rev. Septimus Tuston, at that time chaplain of the senate. The dedication of the building was attended by President Polk.[2] The New England element in the population, to which presumably a Congregational Church would appeal, was large enough or enthusiastic enough to organize a New England society. This was brought about a year and a half before the church movement started.[3] A month later, the first celebration of the landing of the pilgrims held in the city was observed by a dinner given by the society.[1] It may be inferred, from a lack of further notices, that the society had but a brief existence.

---

[1] Celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the First Congregational Church, Washington, 1891, p. 21.

[2] Diary of James K. Polk, Vol. 1, May 31, 1846. Also *Intelligencer*, July 4, 1845, and June 3, 1846. The ground was donated in 1845 by John P. Van Ness and the building was erected by Charles Coltman (Rise, Progress and Influence of Presbyterianism, B. F. Bittenger, p. 19). In 1849 the property was conveyed to Charles Coltman, Lund Washington and Joseph Dorsey, trustees. In 1857 the trustees conveyed to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 14, 1845. The officers of the society were David A. Hall, president; George Bender and N. C. Towles, vice-presidents; George J. Abbott, corresponding secretary; Jesse E. Dow, recording secretary; and R. Farnham, treasurer.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 2, 1846.

CHAPTER XIV

THE DISTRICT SLAVE TRADE

While the struggle between the contending and discordant influences that centred about slavery was approaching what was believed to be a climax in the compromise of 1850, and the advocates of an extension of slave territory had triumphed in the annexation of Texas, it was found the fugitive slave law of 1793 could not be enforced in the north. What was more, owing to the encouragement and aid of a growing antislavery sentiment, an increasing number of slaves were finding their way from bondage to freedom through the agency of the underground railway.

To what extent the owners of slaves in Washington contributed to the passenger business of this mysterious highway it is impossible to state, for on that subject, as well as in regard to that other traffic which fed the slave market of the south and had its depots in Washington, as well as in Alexandria and Baltimore, the prevailing policy was one of silence.

The *National Era* naturally was not influenced by such a policy, and some seven months after its establishment records the departure of a party of eighty-five slaves via the Long Bridge for the south. Two weeks before, it stated, a party of one hundred slaves left the city.[1] Beyond giving these facts, and also that the male slaves were fastened to long chains, in the fashion described by Torrey, thirty years before, the editor had no comment, except to advance the opinion that members of the party were gathered chiefly from the surrounding country of Maryland.

Three years after this record of the extent of the traffic had been made, Henry Clay declared on the floor of the senate, in discussing the pending compromise measure to abolish the slave trade in the District, that but one slave depot remained in the city.[1] He added that the trade was not one in which the citizens of the District were interested, as it was carried on by residents from other places. A few months before these consignments for the slave market were sent from Washington, a shipment was made on the underground railroad. As usual with such traffic to the free states, it was not done openly in the light of day so that the editor of the *National Era* or any one who happened to be abroad could see what was done. On the contrary, in the darkness of the night, when the town was asleep, a colored woman and her five children stole quietly down to the river front, and then were taken aboard a schooner. The vessel had come to the city with a load of oysters and was going back empty, as many vessels did. But in this case the captain was induced to run the risk of incurring the penalties of the law, and consented to take on board the runaways.[2] They reached free soil in safety. This action of Daniel Drayton, the captain of the vessel, brought him into the notice of the abolitionists as one to be intrusted with carrying out a scheme that had evidently been under consideration for some time to effect a large delivery of slaves. The following year of 1848 he was employed by some well-to-do abolitionists to go to Washington and bring away a party of slaves.[3] The enterprise was undertaken. Coming to the city on the schooner *Pearl* with a load of wood, which he sold, in the darkness of the night seventy-six colored men, women and children found their way to the schooner, which was anchored in the channel of the river, a short distance below the 6th Street Wharf. Then the boat set sail and the mouth of the river was reached, when, owing to contrary winds, it was necessary to anchor to await better weather.

---

[1] *National Era*, Sept. 2, 1847.

---

[1] *Congressional Globe*, p. 1743, Sept. 3, 1850. A foreign observer nine years before found but one slave pen. A Visit to the United States in 1841, Joseph Sturge, p. 107.

[2] Personal Memoirs of Daniel Drayton. Boston, 1855.

[3] The same.

The following morning, which was Sunday, some forty families of Georgetown and Washington found no preparations going on for breakfast, and other details in the domestic routine lacking. Then gradually the discovery was made that there had been a general flight of household servants, and in consequence, citizens, among whom was Mrs. Madison, the widow of the former president, had lost slave property which was valued at about $100,000.[1] Learning how the negroes had left the city, a pursuing party hired a steamboat and hurried down the river. The fugitives were secured and brought back. The slaves were committed to the jail as runaways, and then, for the most part, at once sold to a Baltimore slave dealer by their indignant owners, and sent south.[2] Daniel Drayton, as well as the captain of the vessel, was convicted of larceny and kept in the Washington jail for over four years.[3]

The boldness of the attempt, its extent, as well as the knowledge that behind it was the antislavery sentiment of the north, stirred with strong excitement both the citizens and congress. At once, the popular rage was directed towards the organ of the antislavery party that had for nearly a year and a half appeared once a week. During this period nothing had occurred to draw to it any expression of public dislike or hostility. While the editor of the paper had nothing to do with the escape of the slaves, yet popular suspicion was directed to him. On the evening of the day the refugees arrived in the city, a mob surrounded the *Era* office on the east side of 7th Street between F and G streets. A few windows were broken, and then the crowd dispersed. They assembled again the following night, and even went to Dr. Bailey's residence at the southeast corner of 8th and E streets, but in spite of his firmness, as well as his courage, in refusing to yield to the demand to remove his paper from the city, and owing also to the resolute bearing of the city officials and police, the crowd again dispersed without doing any harm.[1] The affair was discussed in the house for three days, and was the cause of a resolution being offered in the senate.[2] The occurrence had nation-wide attention. Joshua R. Giddings of Ohio, the leader of the antislavery forces in the house, and John P. Hale of New Hampshire, who occupied the same position in the senate, at once took the matter up. Before the house was through with the subject, the arguments pro and con in the great national controversy were again marshalled. Horace Mann, prominent as an educator, and one of the free-soil men of Massachusetts, had just entered upon his duties as the successor of John Quincy Adams in the house. He undertook, at the instance of northern abolitionists, the defence of the two men in charge of the schooner, and was assisted by James M. Carlisle of the Washington bar. On the other side appeared Philip Barton Key, the District attorney, who was assisted by Joseph H. Bradley, and in a subsequent trial by Richard S. Coxe.[3] Another member of the house, who, like Mr. Mann, was serving his first term, was Abraham Lincoln of Illinois. At the next session following the attempted slave delivery, Mr. Lincoln informed the house that he believed, if the question of the abolition of slavery in the District was submitted to a vote of the people, the decision would be in favor of doing away with the system. The judgment was the result of consultations which he was at the pains to hold with representative citizens.[1] The bill that was prepared with such an understanding, and introduced in the house, provided for the abolition of slavery and the gradual emancipation of slaves, with a proviso that before being enforced, the measure be submitted to the approval of the people of the District. But it never reached that stage. At the next session of congress, as one of the measures in furtherance of the terms of the compromise bill of 1850, the slave trade in the District was abolished — a concession to the slavery element, and substituted for a more thoroughgoing proposition to do away entirely with the institution in the territory where congress had exclusive power.

---

[1] *Intelligencer* and *Union*, April 19, 1848.

[2] A side-light on the condition of the traffic in slaves in the District two years before it was abolished is afforded by this transaction, as it was conducted by a Baltimore dealer instead of a local dealer.

[3] During this period the jail management changed three times. In December, 1848, a few months before President Polk was succeeded by Taylor, Alexander Hunter, who was in poor health and who had held the office of marshal of the District since 1834, was succeeded by Robert Wallace of Virginia. A year later, in December, 1849, Richard Wallach, a member of the Washington bar, was appointed by President Taylor and served until May, 1853, two months after President Pierce came in. For the five subsequent years Jonah D. Hoover held the office and was followed by William Selden, April 1, 1858 to 1861.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, April 19 and 21; *The Union* April 20 and 22, 1848. Also Daniel R. Goodloe's recollections. *The Star*, Feb. 3, 1894.

[2] *Congressional, Globe*, 30th Cong., 1st Sess., House, pp. 179, 641 and the Senate, p. 656.

[3] Mr. Key, who was a son of Francis Scott Key, became District attorney on the death of James Hoban, Feb. 6, 1846. Two years later, upon the advent of the Whig administration, he was succeeded by Philip R. Fendall, and in the course of four years, when the Democrats carried the national election, Mr. Key was again appointed (*Intelligencer*, Sept. 8, 1853) and served nearly six years, or until his death, Feb. 27, 1859, when he was shot by Daniel E. Sickles. Robert Ould succeeded Key as District attorney. (*The Star*, March 7, 1859.)

The events that have been noted bring out clearly the lack of a common standing ground, where slavery was concerned. This was true of non-slaveholding communities as well as of those where the institution existed. Unless this lack of unity of public sentiment is kept in mind, it would be difficult to account, except as an anomaly, for the appearance, a dozen years prior to the civil war, and in a slaveholding community such as Washington, of an advocate of enlarged rights for the free colored. For, as it proved, there were citizens, few in number, it is true, who believed, and had the liberty to express their views, that the failure to provide for this class in the school bill of 1844 was an unjust discrimination. They therefore asked the common council to grant from the public funds money to provide schools for the free colored. While this appeal was read, and then laid on the table,[2] yet the following year it was made one of the issues in the mayoralty campaign. One of the candidates, Jesse E. Dow, who, however, received but a small proportion of the votes, declared that he was in favor of publicly sustained schools for free colored.[1] The compromise of 1850 did not, as its promoters hoped, put an end to slavery agitation throughout the country. The abolition sentiment increased in volume and in power. The course can be traced in happenings in Washington, where, hardly a year after the last of the compromise measures was placed on the statute books, a school was opened for the education of colored girls. There were then, as has been stated, and had been for many years, schools for the colored people, but they were maintained and taught by that race. But this school represented something more than the intense earnestness of its founder, Miss Myrtilla Miner, for it had behind it the zeal that was making the abolition of slavery more and more a national issue. Miss Miner believed with all her soul that slavery was a grievous wrong, and she sought to destroy it by enlisting against it the influence of educated colored women. So she determined to devote her ability as a teacher to this cause. Having gained the sympathy and coöperation of members of the Society of Friends, she came from New York state, and in the year 1851, with the money that had been given her, began a school in Washington.

---

[1] Nicolay and Hay's Lincoln, Vol. 1, p. 285.

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 4, 1849. The application was made by William H. Gates.

The spectacle was an unusual one for that day, and certainly in that latitude. The neighbors in the vicinity of the school on F Street, between 18th and 19th streets, did not approve of a white woman engaging in such work. In consequence, the school location had to be changed. After several removals in the course of a couple of years, the northern sympathizers supplied the means to buy the entire square bounded by 19th, 20th, N and O streets northwest, then on the outskirts of the city.[2] There her school was carried on until the opening of the war, when, owing to the disturbed conditions of that period, and also to the bad health of Miss Miner, which resulted in her death in 1865, the school was closed. At times the mood of the day was exhibited in attacks made on the pupils, while on one occasion the building was set on fire.

---

[1] Special Report of Commissioner of Education, 1871, p. 215.

[2] The same, p. 208. The deed of June 8, 1853, gives the consideration as $4000. Congress incorporated the school in 1863. When the trustees sold the property in 1872 for $40,000, the income of the fund was used to establish the Miner Normal School.

At the time Miss Miner began her work in Washington, a second attempt to establish a Congregational Church had so far succeeded that the edifice of Trinity Episcopal Church on 5th Street between D and E streets was secured. It had been vacated a few months before, as the parish had erected a larger building at the northeast corner of 3d and C streets northwest. The 5th Street building was refitted and occupied by the First Congregational Society of Washington.[1] This was due to the earnestness as well as the business ability of Rev. J. B. Grinnell, who, then fresh from a theological school, displayed the traits which later on brought him success in business, and made him one of the wealthy men of Iowa. At that time his sole capital was youth and energy. He saw the opportunity in the Trinity Church property, and he also appreciated how the prospect of having the denomination represented in Washington would appeal at that stage in the antislavery movement to the members of the church at the north.

His foresight proved correct, and as the result of personal presentation of the situation in visits to the north, the money was secured and the property was purchased.

But the influence of the division in sentiment that had arisen in antislavery ranks, on the subject of political action, was still strong. The members of the congregation were not united. The church did not thrive, and the young minister went elsewhere. During the months of the year 1851, when efforts were made to set up in Washington the standards of a church that was recognized as opposed to human slavery, a story was appearing week by week in the columns of the *National Era* that swelled the subscription list. When the following year it appeared in book form, it proved to be a potent influence in the creation of opinion against the system of slavery.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 22, 1851.

The author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, had been in the habit of sending contributions to the *Era* before she conceived of this story. The passage of the fugitive slave law, one of the measures of the compromise of 1850, stirred her nature to the depths, and her book was the expression of what she felt.

Two years later this book came from the press, and while the growth of antislavery sentiment was bringing the Republican party into existence, renewed interest was manifested in the Congregational Church. A young man was waiting to be installed as pastor, so a council was called, which from its size, as well as for its representative character, was all out of proportion to the importance of the church. But the location of the church at the heart of the nation was what gave the occasion significance. One hundred and fifty ministers and pastors of the leading churches of the denomination in the country assembled in the spring of 1854. Professor Calvin E. Stowe of Andover Seminary, husband of the author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," the most widely read book of the day, presided, while her brother, Henry Ward Beecher, noted as a preacher, and an antislavery advocate, was one of the delegates.

The Washington atmosphere was not found very genial by a body of that sort, and if it had not been for an intimation from President Pierce, on behalf of one of the members, not a single representative of the church council would have stood in a Washington pulpit, although the sessions continued over the Sabbath.[1] For it was not unusual at that period to oppose slavery agitation while holding antislavery views, and there was nothing inconsistent in a community that favored the abolition of slavery, as Lincoln said was true of Washington, and yet opposed the planting in their midst of an abolition centre, as the Congregational Church was regarded.

As it happened, the theological views of the young aspirant for the Washington pulpit did not suit the council, and he was not received.[1] Then it was stated in the *New York Tribune* that Henry Ward Beecher was likely to be called to the vacant pulpit. The comments that bit of news called forth no doubt voiced prevailing views. "We doubt not," the *Star* observed, "Beecher is impudent enough to essay to establish himself here, if money is to be made by it, notwithstanding his long career of vilification and abuse of this and all other slaveholding communities. We know not what his northern admirers might give him, though we can assure him that if, under pretence of preaching the gospel, he undertakes to malign us after his old fashion in our very midst, the people of Washington will pay him in tar and feathers or some other similar currency. If he wants martyrdom, let him try the experiment."[2] A year before the newly formed Republican party named its first presidential candidate, the *Star* remarked that "in regard to the Republican party of Washington, the sanctum of the editor of the *Era*, presuming that room to be 10 × 12 feet, will hold the whole of the Republican party of Washington."

---

[1] Celebration of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the First Congregational Church, p. 26. The invitation came from Rev. P. D. Gurley, pastor of the F Street Presbyterian Church.

"In truth, no such party has an existence here, unless we take into account our free colored population, some of whom, in all probability, sympathize more or less with the new party."[3] A couple of months prior to this estimate of the strength of the Republican party in Washington, a small club, under the name of the Republican association of Washington, was organized, declaring its opposition to the opening of the territories to slavery. Lewis Clephane, the business manager of the *National Era*, and four others were the promoters of this organization that became an active factor in the presidential campaign of the following year, when the Republican party placed Frémont, its first presidential candidate, in the field.[4] At that time Moncure D. Conway, the brilliant but radical minister of the Unitarian Church, was giving expression to antislavery views that were not at all palatable to many of his congregation, and which finally ended in a severance of the pastoral relations.[1] A similar divisive influence was felt in the Congregational Church. Two years before it went out of existence for the second time a suggestion of the situation is found in a newspaper communication, signed "Trustee," deprecating the use by the *National Era* of the words congregational or antislavery church in referring to the 5th Street congregation.[2] Another phase in the shifting public sentiment of the town is illustrated by the action of the city council in refusing to follow the custom of fourteen years' standing,[3] and set apart a day for thanksgiving to God, apparently because the day was of New England origin.[4] The mayor of the city, James G. Berret, issued a Thanksgiving Day proclamation, in spite of the council's action. But it was asserted that the mayor's course was taken "under the pressure of public opinion."[5] But slight trace is to be found, in the church organizations in the city, of the division that had rent three great denominations. The local Presbyterian churches refused to separate from the northern church, while no church affiliated with the southern body was organized.[6] Some nine years before Lincoln was inaugurated, the only distinctively southern church of any denomination in the city was St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, South.[7] In the course of a few years the church building on 8th Street, just north of H Street, was found to be too small, and in 1860 a building site was purchased at the southwest corner of 9th and E streets northwest, where it was planned to erect an edifice to cost $75,000. But this enterprise was lost sight of in the unsettled conditions of the war period.[1] There was not lacking recognition by several of the religious denominations of Washington as a central point of influence. Besides the appeals on this ground for contributions in aid of church enterprises, from time to time plans were proposed for erecting at the capital church buildings that would have the Nation for their parish, and which members of the denomination, when they came to Washington, would look upon as their church home.

---

[1] *The National Era*, April 7 to 11, 1854, *The Star*, June 23, 1854.

[2] April 17, 1854.

[3] Aug. 22, 1855.

[4] Brief History of the Republican Party. Washington, 1889.

---

[1] Autobiography of Moncure D. Conway, Vol. 1, p. 232, October, 1856. *The Star*, March 12, 1857.

[2] *The Star*, Dec. 19, 1857.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 3, 1845. Joint Resolution of City Council, Nov. 5, 1845, providing for the first Thanksgiving Day.

[4] *The Star*, Nov. 15 and 16, 1859.

[5] The same, Nov. 17, 1859.

[6] The Presbytery of Washington City, p. 10.

[7] An article in *The Star* of June 5, 1897, states that the Central Presbyterian Church being disbanded in 1851, its building on 8th Street was occupied by this congregation. Washington Directory, 1853, p. 88, refers to the new Methodist Church. The title to the property was not acquired until 1857.

The erection of a cathedral on an extensive scale was contemplated by the Catholics in 1846,[2] while six years later a large building site at the southwest corner of John Marshall Place and C Street was purchased by members of Wesley Methodist Episcopal Chapel, and proposed as the location of a national Methodist Church. The plan was approved by the General Conference at its session that year. The next year the Baltimore conference arranged for an active canvass for money, and in the fall of 1854 the corner-stone was laid. However, the business dragged, and it was not until 1869 that the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church edifice was dedicated.[3] The year following the inauguration of a national church enterprise by the Methodists the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States (Old School), in session in Philadelphia, appointed a committee to consider the erection of a Metropolitan Church in Washington.[4] In the course of a few months a large plot of ground on the north side of E Street between 6th and 7th streets was purchased on behalf of the trustees of the General Assembly.[5] Six years later the erection on this site of a section of what was to be the Metropolitan Presbyterian Free Church was begun, but no further progress was made.[6]

---

[1] *The Star*, Sept. 8 and Oct. 20, 1860.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 26, 1846.

[3] Twenty-fifth Anniversary Services Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, p. 25.

[4] *Intelligencer*, May 25, 1853.

[5] The same, Nov. 30, 1853.

[6] Sessford Annals. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 387. About the year 1869 the property was sold and the proceeds, by direction of the

During a large part of the period when slavery was the absorbing, overshadowing issue, another great moral question was agitating the public mind. What should be done to get rid of the drink habit? The temperance movement of the early thirties, that for the most part sought to restrain and moderate the habit, soon broadened out to insistence upon total abstinence. Nine years had been sufficient to convince those who organized the Congressional Temperance Society, in 1833, that mere influence of example in the moderate use of liquor was not sufficient to cope with the power of the drink habit. So the Congressional Total Abstinence Society was organized.[1] Two years later the house joined the senate, which had led the way, by prohibiting in 1837 the sale of spirituous liquor at the senate end of the capitol building. By a joint resolution, the sale was prohibited in the capitol building, not alone of spirituous liquor, but of all intoxicating liquor.[2] The campaign against this evil took on a more aggressive character than in the years before 1840. It was not merely that the treasury clerks organized a total abstinence society instead of a temperance society, and that the printers did the same,[3] but that temperance workers went out and talked temperance on street-corners and in the markets, wherever they could gather an audience. This method was so unusual that its advocates caused a split in the Catholic Total Abstinence Society. In consequence, George Savage and those of like mind withdrew from that organization, and in the fall of 1841 formed the Freemen's Total Abstinence Society.[4] Both organizations flourished. In the course of a year the membership of the Catholic Total Abstinence Society was declared to be some 2000,[5] while a couple of years after the new society had been

---

General Assembly, were used in the erection of the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, which in its name preserves the record of this proposed church enterprise. A History of the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, p. 7.

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 25, Feb. 8 and 19, 1842.

[2] The same, June 7, 1844.

[3] The same, March 3 and 21, 1842.

[4] The same, July 4, 1843.

[5] The same, April 5, 1842.

formed, 2300 signers of the pledge had been secured.[1] The work had assumed such proportions that a building designed for it was needed. With the gift of a lot on the south side of E Street, between 9th and 10th streets northwest, from John P. Van Ness, an active effort was made to sell stock in the Temperance Hall enterprise.[2]

But while the corner-stone was laid in 1843,[3] nearly four years passed before the building was ready for use.[4] In the meantime, the society used the hall in the Medical building, at 10th and E streets, but during the spring and summer open-air gatherings were held at Pennsylvania Avenue and 7th Street and at the Centre Market Square.[5] On the occasion of the passage by congress of the joint resolution excluding the sale of liquor from the capitol building, the temperance workers held a jubilee meeting in front of the east portico of that structure.[6] The influence of the temperance movement was manifest at Christmas, when the general license that had the sanction of custom was so modified that as early as 1842 a change had come, and Christmas passed "without the usual rowdyism, drunkenness and disturbances." [7] The celebration of St. Patrick's Day was a temperance demonstration, as it was "for the first time free from the influence of intoxicating liquors." [8] Such an innovation as the opening of a temperance hotel was witnessed. On the occasion of the dinner given on the anniversary of the founding of the Columbia Typographical Society, for the first time on such an occasion no wine was served.[9] Addresses from reformed drunkards were features of the popular meetings that had a special appeal. At least two members of congress were enrolled among the rescued, and as the public was duly informed, they would tell the story of the change wrought in their lives, at a public meeting.[1] Another convert to sobriety had taken to driving a hack, but had the misfortune of a runaway accident. Then the public was notified "a temperance benefit" would be held to provide the needed sum for repairs. On this occasion it was promised the reformed man would "give his extraordinary experiences."[2] It was not long before an attempt was made to issue a newspaper in the interests of this cause. The publication of a weekly was begun.[3] In the course of three months a more ambitious plan was formed, as a tri-weekly was issued by a committee representing the various temperance organizations.[4] The profits were to be used in paying off the debt on Temperance Hall. It is quite evident the plan of publishing a newspaper by a committee was found to be impracticable, as after an experiment of a little more than two months, the ownership became individual, and then the paper appeared as a daily.[5] But the change of management did not prolong the life of the paper apparently much beyond two years.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 4, 1843. George Savage was the president, Darius Clagett, treasurer, and J. L. Henshaw, financial secretary.

[2] The same, Feb. 13 and June 5, 1843.

[3] The same, July 4 and 10, 1843.

[4] The same, Feb. 15, 1847. On one occasion John B. Gough, then in the opening years of his career as a temperance advocate, gave his services to help along the Washington enterprise. *Intelligencer*, May 25, 1846.

[5] The same, April 22 and May 16, 1844.

[6] The same, June 7, 1844.

[7] The same, Dec. 23, 1842.

[8] The same, March 23, 1842.

[9] The same, Jan. 17, 1845.

Another phase of temperance agitation, suggesting the posters used in modern social campaigns, is to be found in the style employed in a newspaper advertisement. It appeared under the heading "The Liquor Traffic. $500,000 are wasted annually in this city by the use of liquor." Then follows an enumeration of the debit charges against the traffic.[1] At another time a novelty was announced, as it was stated a temperance meeting, with the consent of the proprietor, would be held in the bar-room in the basement of the assembly-rooms on Louisiana Avenue, between John Marshall Place and 6th Street.[2] In this movement several thousand people, in a community of some thirty thousand, were actively interested. On the occasion of the celebration of Fourth of July and at other times a dozen temperance organizations turned out.[3] When Father Theobald Mathew, the Irish temperance advocate, visited the city in 1847, a reception was proposed to be given him by the various temperance societies.[4] Both houses of congress extended to him the privilege of the floor, and the president entertained him at dinner.[5] In the opening years of the decade of 1850, after nearly thirty years of efforts, the question began to be asked: What were the practical results? What was there to show for all that had been done? It was conceded that when total abstinence was substituted for moderation in the temperance platform, a forward step had been taken. It was also recognized that the later phases of temperance methods, the street meetings, the going out after men, encouraging and helping them by personal influence and effort to overcome the drink habit, showed an advance in the education of the community. But what had been accomplished through the legislative power of congress or the regulative function of the city corporation? Nothing had been done by congress, and in fact there is no record that during all these years was it asked to do anything.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 3, 1842, and Nov. 17, 1843.

[2] The same, March 13, 1843.

[3] *The Washingtonian.* George Cochran and Co., publishers. *Intelligencer*, Feb. 28 and April 30, 1845. Library of congress file, June 7–Sept. 27, 1845.

[4] *The Columbian Fountain.* Library of congress, Nov. 4, 1845–Jan. 24, 1846.

[5] *The Daily Fountain.* Ulysses Ward, publisher Library of congress file, Jan. 27, 1846–Jan. 30, 1847. Mr. Ward was the president of the Temperance Hall Association, and J. L. Henshaw, secretary. (*Intelligencer*, May 29, 1847.) In less than two years, Mr. Ward (*Intelligencer*, Jan. 24, 1848) offered for sale the *Columbian Fountain*, "a well-established temperance paper, as the present proprietor finds his duties as minister of the gospel (Methodist Protestant Church) at Philadelphia prevents his giving the necessary attention." The following year Mr. Ward became the second president of the Washington Gaslight Co., serving from April 14, 1849 to Jan. 3, 1851.

Beyond requiring the signature of property holders to tavern licenses, and the publication each year of the list of licenses issued and the names of the indorsers, liquor selling was not regulated by the corporation until after the beginning of the decade of 1840. Then Sunday selling was made unlawful, and it was also prohibited on other days, from twelve midnight to four o'clock in the morning.[1] But even the provisions as found in the three ordinances that embrace the entire legislation on this subject, up to the year 1850, were declared by the mayor, Walter Lenox, difficult to enforce, as it was almost impossible to establish, by legal proofs, violations.[2] He recognized, what was subsequently established by judicial decisions, that the powers of the corporation as to taverns were limited, as they owed their existence to a law inherited from Maryland. But still, he urged, even if the corporation had not the power to deny to taverns the right to do business, yet they could be better regulated. Soon after the mayor had made this statement the temperance people fully corroborated what he had said about the difficulty of enforcing excise laws by asserting that the 500 grog-shops or liquor places in the city were open night and day, although for seven years an ordinance had been in force restricting the hours for liquor selling. It was also realized that the proportion of one drinking place to every 80 inhabitants was about the same as it was thirty years before.[3] Then it was announced that as far as the temperance people were concerned, "the delusion that moral suasion was adequate had been abandoned. Now it was moral suasion for the unhappy inebriate and the ballot-box for the rum seller." [4]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 16, 1851.

[2] The same, July 3, 1845.

[3] The same, Jan. 31 and June 29, 1842, May 21, 1846.

[4] The same, June 15, 1847.

[5] The same, Dec. 19, 1847.

At that time those interested in temperance reform were disappointed in the results of an ordinance which was passed a few weeks after the mayor's message was received. For it was expected that as a species of local option was provided, it would be possible to get rid of a number of drinking places. The new ordinance directed that instead of requiring the signatures of owners of property in the vicinity of the places proposed to be established, the recommendation of a majority of the white housekeepers residing on the same side of the square and on the side fronting opposite must be secured.[1] As the mayor was advised by the corporation attorney, this ordinance was not applicable to taverns, but only to bars or tippling-houses. The practical outcome was an increase in tavern licenses and a decrease in bar-room licenses. However, it was held by some that the regulation could be made applicable to taverns if the wording was more explicit, and so at the next session of the council this supposed defect was corrected.[2] That hope proving false, public sentiment was aroused. It was decided no longer to legalize the traffic, but to get rid of "this anomaly of legislation," as Judge Thurston had characterized it more than thirty years before. A prohibitory law had then been in force in Maine for eight years, while prohibition was an issue in other localities in New England and New York. It was decided that Washington should join the ranks. The city council therefore adopted a resolution directing the submission of the question of license or no license to the voters.[3] An animated campaign followed. A series of mass-meetings were held, and when the ballots were counted, it was found that "no license" had won by a two-thirds vote.[4] Recognizing the limitation in the powers of the corporation as to taverns, the city council directed, in case the people decided against continuing the license system, that the committee of the council in charge of the interests of the city before congress urge that body to so amend the charter as to enable the council to prohibit the sale of all intoxicating liquor.[5] By that time a new city council had come in, with a Know Nothing majority. At once the instructions were given to secure from congress the additional authority needed.[6] While such a request was made, congress did not act. When the current session of that body came to an end, it was decided to give effect to the verdict of the people without further delay. The city council therefore enacted two measures, prohibiting all retail liquor selling and fixing a scale of license fees for wholesale dealers.[1] As was generally supposed would be the case, the law, in the course of a few months, was declared by the circuit court to be invalid as far as taverns were concerned, but applicable to bar-rooms or tippling places, or shops, as they were also called.[2] With the exception of a Sunday-closing ordinance, enacted three years later to take the place of the one repealed by the ordinance of 1854, no change was made in the status of the liquor business during the seventeen years that remained of the mayoralty form of government. But while that was the case, yet the traffic apparently soon got back to its former condition. Four years after the law was passed, prohibiting the retailing of liquor in the city, the *Star* explained, in reply to an inquiry as to why the corporation granted such licenses, that they were really not licenses, but contracts between the corporation and the dealer.[3] Apparently the interest in temperance reform died out after the failure of the supreme effort of 1854. Congress was not again solicited on the subject, although the people were reminded of the limited scope of their municipal powers when, three years later, the ordinance was passed, reviving a previous ordinance which forbade the sale of liquor on Sunday. An exception was made in the case of guests and travellers at taverns or ordinaries. As to the closing of business places generally on that day, there was no municipal regulation until 1864. The law inherited from Maryland was in force which forbade "any bodily labor on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday." It had sufficient vitality and scope to answer the needs of the community, as no change was made for more than sixty years.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 2, 1843.

[2] In Laws, 1851.

[3] *American Telegraph*, Jan. 23, 1852. Address of the Grand Worthy Patriarch, Sons of Temperance.

[4] The same.

---

[1] Ordinance, Oct. 28, 1851. *Intelligencer*, Oct. 29, 1851.

[2] *Intelligencer*, 14, 1852. Ordinance, Oct. 27, 1852.

[3] Joint Resolution, May 14, 1853.

[4] *Intelligencer*, June 1 and 8, 1853.

[5] Joint Resolution, May 14, 1853.

[6] Resolution, Jan. 20, 1854.

---

[1] Ordinances, Oct. 9 and 12, 1854. The selling of liquor in quantities less than a pint was forbidden. A few days after the passage of these ordinances the *Globe* (Oct. 19, 1854) speaks of the accumulation by some dealers of pint flasks in anticipation of the demand created by these regulations.

[2] Haywood and Hazelton, Vol. 2, p. 175, Dec. 23, 1854.

[3] Dec. 24, 1858.

When an application was made, on behalf of Jews, to be allowed to keep their places of business open on that day, the mayor stated, that in obedience to the Maryland law, he felt it was his duty to insist that all such places be closed.[1] At that time the number of Jews in Washington had increased, as compared with the small colony at the beginning of the decade. By the year 1852 a sufficient number was resident in the city to warrant the organization of the Washington Hebrew Congregation.[2] Services were held in private houses, and then in rented rooms, until 1855 — the year a charter was granted by congress — when the congregation located at the southeast corner of 9th and D streets northwest. Six years later, what had been known as Harmony Hall, on D Street between 12th and 13th streets, was secured,[3] and then in less than two years, the building of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was purchased, occupying the site of the present temple.[4] Two years before the people of the city, by a decided vote, declared against the continuance of the system of sanctioning the liquor traffic, the mayor, in his message to the council, declared that "intemperance is the cause almost exclusively of all the disturbances and pauperism which afflict our community." [5] But while the mayor favored stricter regulation as a remedy, the council had already decided that in view of the prevailing conditions, a police force of fifteen men, doing duty only at night, was no longer adequate, whatever might have been the case in 1842, when this method of restraining disorder was provided by congress. For the day, the old-time system was still in use, of constables and magistrates, both getting their pay, not from the common treasury, but from the fees of the cases which were brought against citizens. Naturally, the constables were more interested in bringing cases than in the preservation of peace and the detection of crime. Finally, the entire system, with its abuses and old-time flavor, was cast aside, and after an existence of half a century the municipality had, for the first time, a police force whose distinctive and only duty was the preservation of the peace and order of the city.[1] Instead of fees, yearly salaries were provided, both for magistrates and police officers. As the fees were paid into the city treasury, the new system was, from the start, practically self-supporting. The power of appointing the members of the new force was given to the mayor, with the advice and consent of the board of aldermen.[2] As the Auxiliary Guard continued its night service, the new city police served during the day, and this system was maintained down to the opening years of the war, a duplex police which did fairly well, but like some other features of government by congress was an anomaly. For two years the two police forces had a total strength of fifteen men each. Then congress doubled the size of the night force, by making an addition of fifteen men.[3] A year after this provision had been made, as if to supply an object-lesson of the disturbed, unsettled state of the public mind that marked the community life in Washington, as well as that of other towns, in the decade of unrest and agitation preceding the civil war, a gang of men, shortly after midnight, went to the Washington Monument. Shutting the watchman securely in his watch-box, a block of marble presented by the Pope was removed from the shed where it was stored. After defacing and breaking it, the pieces were thrown into the river.[1] The affair aroused country-wide attention, as it was regarded as another evidence of the aggressive purposes of the American party, or to use the popular name, Know Nothing party, that had become an unsettling element in politics throughout the country. With the motto, America for Americans, and a platform of opposition to foreigners and Catholics, and with the attractive influence of a secret organization, the new party gained a following which included many worthy and influential citizens. Nearly two decades passed after the organization of the American party before it began to be a power in local politics. Then, as had been the case in other towns, it secured control of the Washington city government. Its candidate, John T. Towers, was elected mayor in 1854, defeating John W. Maury, who had just completed a term of two years. Maury had gone into office by the votes of both Whigs and Democrats,[2] and by defeating Walter Lenox, the long line of Whig mayors that began in Jackson's second term, in 1834, came to an end. During this period of nearly twenty years three Democratic and two Whig administrations had been in power, and yet the chief executive of the city had been invariably chosen from the ranks of the Whig party.[3] There was nothing distinctive in the local election of 1852 because it was free from national politics, for that was true of many previous contests, as the succession of Whig mayors demonstrates. Nor, indeed, did the mere coincidence, that the election of Maury, a Democrat, as mayor of the city, was followed, a few months later, by the choice of Franklin Pierce, Democrat, as president of the United

---

[1] *The Star*, Nov. 21, 1859.

[2] A History of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, by Rabbi Abram Simon. Washington, 1905. The author states that "a fairly strong colony of Jews lived here as early as 1847." By 1850 a burial-ground had been secured on the Hamilton Road which, enlarged, is still in use.

[3] *The Star*, Sept. 5, 1861.

[4] The same, July 29, 1863. The congregation numbered about 80.

[5] In Laws, 1851.

---

[1] City Ordinance, March 11, 1851.

[2] For the first year Captain Goddard served as the head both of the city and of the federal police. (*Intelligencer*, June 26, 1851, and Sept. 14, 1852.) Then the next year the Democrats came into power, followed by the Know Nothings, and then a fusion candidate and then the Democrats again. The changes in the captains of the day force or chiefs of police, as they were also called, reflect the political fluctuations and were as follows: Horatio N. Steele (*Intelligencer*, Sept. 14, 1852), John Davis (*The Star*, July 11, 1854), James W. Baggott (The same, June 10, 1856), F. A. Klopper (The same, Aug. 12, 1857). With the exception of four years, 1854–1858, when James H. Birch and John Mills served for two years each, Captain Goddard continued head of the Auxiliary Guard until it was replaced by the Metropolitan Police in 1861.

[3] Stats., 10, 206, March 3, 1853.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, March 8, 1854.

[2] *The Union*, June 9, 1852.

[3] At two of these biennial election periods only one candidate was named — Peter Force in 1838 and W. W. Seaton in 1844. The only other instance of an uncontested mayoralty election was in 1828, when Joseph Gales was the sole nominee. *Intelligencer*, May 10, 1852; *The Star*, May 30, 1854.

States, make any change in the usual course followed in arranging for the inaugural ceremonies.

For however the political affiliation of the president of the United States and the mayor of Washington might vary, the local management of the inaugural ceremonies was always in the hands of the party winning at the national polls. The extent to which the minority party was permitted to take part seemed to depend on the degree of feeling displayed during the campaign. As has been stated, the triumph of party at the election of Jackson was followed, for the first time, by an avowed partisan inaugural management. Twelve years later, when the succession of Democrats in the White House was interrupted by the victory of General Harrison, the fervor of that campaign was felt after its close, and led to the exclusion of Democrats from taking part, as citizens, in arranging for the Harrison inaugural ceremonies. Four years later, when Polk, the banner bearer of the Democratic party, was elected, the appointment of an inaugural ball committee was authorized, as had been the old time custom, from those subscribing for ball tickets.[1] The publication of the list of names selected showed that it included those of well-known Whigs. Then the several Democratic associations of the District rebelled. In spite of the explanation that of the one hundred and eleven committee members, only eleven were Whigs,[2] the opposition was not appeased. As the committee list was not purged, the decision was reached to give a ball under the exclusive management of Democrats, and also one that would be Democratic in price. So the National Theatre was leased, and the tickets placed at $5. The other committee secured Carusi's and sold tickets at $10. President Polk attended both balls.[3] The democracy of the bolters from the regular ball committee did not include the ability to arrange with success such a detail as caring for the wraps of those who attended the ball, so that "in the chaos of cloaks and hats" many failed to get their own, or even those of their neighbors.[1] Perhaps, after all, this defect in the management may have been merely an indication that conditions had changed, and that arrangements suited for the attendance at inaugural balls of the past were no longer adapted for increased numbers. It is quite evident that something of the sort had taken place, which explains how it happened that the managers of the other ball, for the first time in the history of such events, had to dispose of a surplus of receipts over expenditures. This was accomplished by dividing over one thousand dollars between the two orphan asylums.[2] As the theatre had to be in readiness for the performance for the evening following the ball, the mass of unclaimed hats and coats were taken next door to the *Globe* office, where the public was notified lost articles might be looked for. As it proved, the removal was made to a place of safety, for hardly had the audience that evening become interested in the play, when it was startled by a cry of fire. All managed to escape from the flames that left nothing of the theatre building but the walls. The spread of the fire to other buildings in the vicinity was largely checked, so that the community had reason to be thankful there had been no loss of lives and a relatively small one of property. But it was realized that the building, which was built six years before, was the only place of the sort in the city. What that loss meant may perhaps be inferred, as six years passed before another theatre building was erected on the site.[3] Even with the National Theatre out of the way, an attempt to revive the old assembly-hall on Louisiana Avenue as a theatrical centre proved a failure. After more than twelve months, theatrical performances were again renewed, the hall in the second story of the Odeon building, at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and John Marshall Place, being secured. The building had been finished only a few weeks before the National Theatre was destroyed.[1] Some two years later, a large building on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue, between 6th and 4½ streets, used in later years as a carriage manufactory, was fitted up for theatrical purposes, and was given the name of the Adelphi Theatre,[2] and that became the theatre of the city until the National was rebuilt, in 1851.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 25, 1844.

[2] *Daily Globe*, Feb. 3, 1845.

[3] The innovation of four years before, of having a committee to arrange for the parade as well as one for the ball, was followed. According to the precedent then established, the parade or inaugural committee was again appointed by the local political organization of the party victorious in the national election. (*The Daily Globe*, Feb. 20, 1845.) As at the Harrison inauguration, a platform was built out over the steps of the east front of the capitol building. (*Intelligencer*, March 4, 1845.)

---

[1] *Daily Globe*, March 5, 1845.

[2] *Intelligencer*, March 20, 1845.

[3] The same, Dec. 1, 1851. In 1850, when Jenny Lind came to this country, a large temporary hall was built on the foundations of the old theatre and there she appeared. This structure was replaced the next year by a new National Theatre, which survived the hazards of the business until 1857, when it was destroyed by fire.

Again, as in 1840, the presidential election which four years later brought James K. Polk to the White House left its traces upon the fortunes of the newspapers of Washington. Polk and the annexation of Texas policy had won. The southern wing of the party had carried the day, and in its hour of triumph did not have a kindly feeling for the *Globe,* that represented the Van Buren element, and had spoken of the leader of the Texas annexation movement as John Catiline Calhoun. But if the *Globe* was not acceptable as a party organ, what was to be done? For at that period it was unthinkable that an administration could get along without a recognized newspaper mouthpiece at the capital city. "For want of an official organ to explain the principles of action," observed the *Boston Advertiser*, the Polk administration, then a month old, "has acquired no political character."[3] At first it was proposed to merge the *Constitution,* the Calhoun organ of the southern section of the party, and the *Madisonian,* that had followed Tyler into the Polk ranks, and crush out the *Globe.*[4] A more pacific course was followed. The *Globe* establishment was purchased, and the *Washington Union* issued in place of the *Globe.* The veteran editor of the *Richmond Enquirer,* Thomas Ritchie, then past his seventieth year, one of the most influential political editors of the day, and acceptable to both factions of the Democratic party, was selected to conduct the new organ. Associated with him in the publication was John P. Heiss, the publisher of the *Nashville Union*, the home organ of President Polk.[1] The price paid for the *Globe* was $35,000, one-third cash and the balance in two equal instalments, at one and two years.[2] As soon as congress assembled, the perquisites of such a position came to the new organ, as both houses chose its proprietors to do the public printing. The balance of the purchase money was not delayed, as may be inferred from the recording of the deed of the Union building to Messrs. Ritchie and Heiss, a little more than two years later.[3] In addition, the field was soon cleared of much of the competition. Although Tyler, in the closing days of his administration, signed the Texas admission bill, yet the *Constitution*, the faithful advocate of that issue so vital from the southern point of view, was passed over in the selection of an administration organ. As a result, eight months after Polk's inauguration, its publication office was removed to Baltimore.[4] The *Madisonian*, with change of management and of name, first to the *United States Journal* and then to the *Daily Times*, spent a year advocating the views of the southern element of the party, and then went out of existence,[5] thus bringing to a close a somewhat varied career of nine years.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 10, 1845.

[2] The same, Dec. 20, 1847.

[3] Reprinted in the *Intelligencer*, April 15, 1845.

[4] Letters of General Jackson. Journalism in the United States, p. 241.

By the spring of 1846, the Washington daily field, where, the year before, four dailies appeared, had now only two — the *Intelligencer* and the *Union*. There was no change in this situation until the approach of another presidential election. The crop of minor papers during the period of the Polk administration was not as luxuriant as usual.[1] While in some respects the career of the *Union* as a party organ began under favorable auspices, yet the movement that had been under way for nearly a decade, to divorce, in the phrase of the day, the public printing from the newspaper press, had gained such headway that in the closing days of the session of congress, that ended just before the inauguration of Polk, a law was passed, making a reduction of twenty per cent in the scale of prices for printing fixed by the law of 1819.[2] In spite of the cheapening of the cost of printing, due to new processes and inventions, as well as the increase in the volume of the work, congress had gone on, for nearly thirty years, paying the same rate for its printing. Apparently, the profits from public printing did not cut as large a figure at that period as the political influence in its distribution. To eliminate such a factor was evidently the purpose of the law of Aug. 3, 1846, enacted at the following session. For then the public printing was directed to be given to the lowest bidder, instead of each house electing a printer to do the work at the rates prescribed by law. Only a few years before a similar method had been adopted for the printing for the departments.[3] As the law did not go into effect until the end of the current congress, Ritchie and Heiss had the profits of the work for two years. But in a short time after the new system was in operation, "the printers of the city," the *Intelligencer* declared, "were left empty handed with unemployed establishments (dead capital) on their hands."[1] For, as it proved, when the work was thrown open to competition, the bid of Wendell and Van Benthuysen of Albany, N. Y., was the lowest. At once, the necessary printing material was brought to the city, and placed in a building on Pennsylvania Avenue, near 2d Street, by Cornelius Wendell, who had been the foreman of the Van Benthuysen printing plant in Albany, and to whom the new venture was entirely intrusted. Before the close of his contract, congress was informed by Mr. Wendell that he had not made sufficient allowance for the peculiar requirements, the leading one being the necessity of furnishing a great quantity of printed matter in a short time. Although his appeal for relief was based on a loss, he continued in the printing business in Washington. When, some four years later, he again became officially connected with the public printing after the contract plan was given up, he was able to provide the largest and best-equipped printing establishment the city had seen. It was not long before he was doing practically all of the public printing as a subcontractor for those whom the two houses elected each congress as printers.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 3, 1845.

[2] 31st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 55, p. 34, Sept. 30, 1850. Testimony of John C. Rives, who gave it as his opinion that Ritchie and Heiss cleared more than enough money from printing the patent office report in the season of 1845–1846 to pay the entire amount.

[3] Recorder of Deeds, office W. B. 132, folio 428, June 16, 1847.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 26, 1845.

[5] U. S. Journal, May 1, 1845. *Daily Times*, Feb. 2 and March 24, 1846. J. B. Jones sold the paper to Jesse E. Dow, recently doorkeeper of the house, and Theophilus Fisk, a Norfolk, Va., editor. When the name was changed, H. H. Robinson, formerly of the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, was made editor.

---

[1] The following are given as noted in the columns of the *Intelligencer:* *Daily Bee.* A penny paper by Messrs. Gobright, Malvin and Stilte. In less than a month the editors found "the majority of the people did not want a penny paper" and so stopped its publication. (*Intelligencer*, Aug. 18 and Sept. 22, 1845.) *Morris National Press and Journal Weekly.* George Morris, proprietor and editor. (*Intelligencer*, Feb. 17, 1846.) *The Talisman and Odd Fellows Magazine.* Semi-monthly, Theophilus Fisk, publisher. (*Intelligencer*, April 22, 1846.) *Saturday Evening News and District General Advertiser.* Weekly and semi-weekly, William Thompson, editor. (*Intelligencer*, June 25 and Nov. 24, 1846; Same, March 15, 1858, paper discontinued.) *Plumbe Popular Magazine.* Monthly, No. 1, by the National Publishing Co. (*Intelligencer*, Dec. 16, 1846.) *The American*, tri-weekly, James N. Davis and Columbus Drew, neutral in politics and religion. (*Intelligencer*, Dec. 23, 1846.) Became a daily. (The same, May 29, 1847.) Discontinued. (*National Era*, July 29, 1847.)

[2] Stats., 5, p. 964, March 3, 1845.

[3] The same, p. 526, Aug. 26, 1842.

When the next letting of the printing of congress was made, the *Union* office was the lowest bidder, thus uniting again the press and public printing. Then followed an out-of-town bidder, who proved to be a failing contractor. After a trial of the contract system for six years, congress went back to the old method, adopting, however, a new schedule of rates.

The Washington printers were not alone in facing problems due to the adoption of the contract system. Congress also had one. How were its proceedings and debates to be reported and published? How could the Washington newspapers be expected to print reports that would be satisfactory to members of congress, that is, verbatim reports, when there was no prospect of compensation for such a service? As the *Intelligencer* very frankly explained, that was "an expense which the newspaper never could have met but for the actual or anticipated possession of the printing of congress, which each in their turn has enjoyed, and which at the rates fixed by law had become sufficiently profitable (by the reduction in the cost of paper, the introduction of power presses, and the practice of printing large extra numbers of heavy documents) to justify a heavy expenditure in this service." [1] According to the same authority, it was this consideration that led the senate, before the close of the congress, when the contract printing law went into effect, to make direct provision for having its proceedings reported and printed, — the first time such a thing had been done by either house. A sum in bulk was appropriated, and James A. Houston of New York agreed to do the work, which included a daily as well as the sessional report, the latter in book form. In order to furnish the daily report he issued a newspaper called the *United States Reporter*.[2] But the daily reports came out a week late, and then two weeks, and besides the cost was much greater than had been estimated, and so, at the end of the first session, the arrangement was ended.[3] So the senate went back to the newspaper reports, and as for the house, it had refused to enter into the new arrangement. In spite of the failure of the Houston undertaking the principle was not abandoned. For the practice then begun of paying directly for such a service was continued. Congress, however, made no experiments, but put the reporting of its proceedings in the same class as the public printing. A column rate was adopted, and then the work went to whatever newspaper might be selected. One of the immediate results, as might be expected, was that the reports became fuller and more complete. By the beginning of the 31st Congress in 1851, the proceedings were practically reported verbatim, instead of such portions being preserved as in the judgment of the reporters or the editors appeared to be worth while. The *Intelligencer* and the *Union*, according as the Whigs or the Democrats held the majority in either house, benefited by this new arrangement. But neither attempted to bring out the proceedings in book form, as Blair and Rives continued to do, even after having disposed of the *Globe* newspaper and its plant. A building suitable for a printing-office was erected by the firm in the course of a few months, as Jackson Hall was built on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 3d Street and John Marshall Place.[1] As soon as congress began paying for the newspaper space occupied by its proceedings, which had been given without direct consideration, then the daily *Globe* was revived,[2] and Blair and Rives were prepared to furnish daily reports as well as the sessional reports. But while they still retained the political views they had seven years before when they yielded to the demands of the situation, and retired as editors of a party organ, they announced that the new series of the *Globe* was to be non-political. As they were then entering upon their career as the official reporters of congress, they realized that partisanship was out of the question. While for a time one or both houses paid other papers for printing its proceedings, yet the *Globe* soon became the recognized official reporter of congress, a position which it successfully maintained for a quarter of a century, or until congress undertook the work by publishing the *Congressional Record*.[3]

---

[1] Dec. 25, 1848.

---

[1] Dec. 25, 1848.

[2] *National Era*, Aug. 5, 1847.

[3] Proceedings and debates of the U. S. Senate, 1st Sess., 30th Cong., by James A. Houston. Washington, 1848.

As will be noted, the *Globe* encountered competition for the daily reports, but none in publishing the sessional reports. A statement made by John C. Rives, some years later, helps to understand the cause of this distinction. For he declared that the profit in publishing the *Congressional Globe,* as the sessional report was known, came from the sale of the back numbers. The year following the reappearance of the *Globe* newspaper Mr. Blair sold out his interest in the business to Mr. Rives, and retired from the firm because, as Mr. Rives said, "the business of the office would not support both,"[1] a statement which needs to be read, in order to be accurately understood, in the light of the fact that when Mr. Blair left the business, he retired to his farm at Silver Spring, Md. adjoining the northern bounds of the District, where he spent the remainder of his life, occupying his town house in the winter.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 1, 1845. The three-story-back building was fitted up as a printing-office, while the front building was designed to bring in a revenue, as the first-floor space was arranged for use as stores and the upper floors as ball-rooms.

[2] The same, Oct. 20 and Dec. 6, 1848.

[3] The list of "Reporters in Congress" and the newspapers represented by them as printed in the city directory of 1853, p. 47, shows the dominance of *The Globe* at that period. *The Globe* also carried at its column head the words, Official Reporter of Congress.

The circumstances of his partner, Mr. Rives, justified his having a farm near Bladensburg, where he indulged in the luxury of being a gentleman farmer. As subcontracting was a resource with Washington printers who had larger political influence than printing facilities, it may be concluded that a plant like Blair and Rives was not dependent on the profits of printing the debates, especially as the market for the sale of such printed matter was not large. No doubt the public estimate of the value of the debates was generally the same as that which finds frequent expression in the discussions. For a good many members were of the opinion that the debates of that body were not worth preserving. Still in 1824, when Gales and Seaton inaugurated the practice of bringing out the proceedings in book form, and then a little more than a decade later began to print the proceedings of congresses prior to 1824, these projects were encouraged by both houses by annual subscriptions. That the debates of congress were not popular reading may be concluded from the course pursued by newspapers outside of Washington. For only condensed reports of the proceedings of both houses were printed.[2] Even before Jackson became president, the letter-writers or newspaper correspondents had begun to make it their duty to furnish comment and gossip from Washington rather than to confine themselves to the details of what congress was doing.

---

[1] *The Globe*, June 23, 1856. Reprinted in Journalism in the United States, pp. 251 and 253.

[2] Journalism in America, p. 541. Horace Greeley's testimony in 1851 before a committee of the English parliament.

A year after the senate arranged in 1848 for reporting its debates, the New York Associated Press was formed. One of its functions was to supply its members with the regular proceedings of both houses, which left the letter-writers entirely free to choose their subjects. A suggestion of the popularity of these gossipy and often bright and sparkling comments on current happenings at the Nation's capital, is to be found in an advertisement of a Washington bookseller, that he had arranged to get an abundant supply of copies of the *New York Express*, containing "Waits from Washington."[1] At times, when partisan politics were the inspiration perhaps both with the writers and with congress, that body sought to discipline these free lances. During the session of 1848 the correspondent of a Whig journal related with much detail how an active member of the Democratic party each day retired to the space in the rear of the speaker's chair, where he ate his luncheon of bread and sausage that he had brought with him, wrapped in paper. The writer did not forget to add that, when the greasy contents of the greasy paper were disposed of, the Ohio statesman wiped his fingers on his hair and picked his teeth with his jack-knife. The lampooned member appealed to the house, which, by a decisive vote, deprived the offender of the privilege of a seat on the floor, and for the rest of the session he was obliged to witness the proceedings from the ladies' gallery, to which he was given access by members who did not sympathize with the course of the house.[2] Not many weeks later, the *New York Herald* correspondent got hold of a copy of the treaty with Mexico, that had been sent to the senate as a confidential document. When the treaty was printed in his newspaper, the senate ordered his arrest, and kept him in close confinement for the rest of the session. While an application was made to the circuit court for a habeas corpus, the court held that the senate had the right to imprison for contempt, and that the court had no jurisdiction.[1]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 15, 1848.

[2] Recollections of Men and Things at Washington, L. A. Gobright, p. 84.

---

[1] Recollections of Men and Things at Washington, L. A. Gobright, p. 84. Also *Intelligencer*, May 15, 1848, for the court proceedings. In an account of a meeting of "editors, letter-writers and reporters of the city" in the *Intelligencer*, of April 7, 1848, to express sympathy with the Republican movement in France, the following names are given: W. W. Seaton, Amos Kendall, Isaac Hill, Thomas Ritchie, E. Kingman, Erastus Brooks, W. E. Robinson, James A. Houston, G. Bailey, Jr., G. B. Wallis, L. F. Tasistro, M. M. Noah, Francis J. Grund and Messrs. Prevost, Fitman, and Thomas.

CHAPTER XV

WHIG VICTORY OF 1848

When the Whigs came in power by the election to the presidency of Zachary Taylor in 1848, the influence of the ardent campaign and the fervor of the Rough and Ready Clubs may be traced in the preparations for the inauguration which, as far as the management of the ball was concerned, was a party affair. Whigs only were to have a hand in planning for the great quadrennial festivity. By the middle of January, some seven weeks before the day of inauguration, workmen had begun the erection of a frame building adjoining the city hall on the west, where the ball was to be held.[1] Four days after the public had read with wonder that a building was to be specially built for the ball, and that it was to be one hundred and sixty feet long, fifty feet wide and twenty in height, and was speculating upon the splendor of such a spacious room, with walls lined with white cotton and lighted by candles, and heated by stoves, a call was published for a meeting of men, "without distinction of party," to arrange for a rival affair.[2] But after all, party lines were recognized in the choice of the managers of the second ball, as half were taken from the Whig party and half from the Democratic party.[3] So the National Inauguration Ball was held at Jackson Hall and the Grand Inauguration Ball at the pavilion, while, with no thought of politics, the visiting military were entertained by a ball at Carusi's. In spite of the competition of the cheaper admission charge to the Jackson Hall affair — for the pavalion ball tickets cost $10 — as well as the extra outlay for a ball-room, the surplus was larger than that of the principal ball of four years before.[1] Three months after the inauguration the *National Whig,* a daily, closed a career that had, at the best, been a struggle from the very beginning.[2] When General Taylor came to select a newspaper organ, he passed by the *Intelligencer,* but as it had resources, it continued to live. The circumstances of the *National Whig* were quite different, and when it missed the favor of the new president, then, like many that had gone before it, existence was no longer possible. Its fate was no doubt looked upon by at least two men, the editor and the publisher, as another instance of the ingratitude of princes. For a week after the news had been received, in the spring of 1847, of the victory of Buena Vista, which really made possible the candidacy of General Taylor, the *Whig* made its appearance. In the language of its editor it was "the first paper in the Union to throw the Taylor flag to the breeze."

---

[1] *The National Whig*, Jan. 15, 1849.

[2] The same, Jan. 19, 1849.

[3] The same, Jan. 27, 1849.

But General Taylor wanted men whom he knew to be his mouthpiece at the Nation's capital, and so A. A. Bullett, of the *New Orleans Picayune,* and John O. Sargent, of the *New York Courier and Enquirer,* came to the city and established the *Republic,* a daily.[3] Then in a year the president was dead. His successor, Millard Fillmore, was kindly disposed towards the *Intelligencer,* and so it came in for a share, with the *Republic,* of the honor and profit of upholding the course of the party throughout the balance of the administration. Of the other two dailies, the *Globe* was primarily the publisher of the proceedings of congress and only incidentally a newspaper, while the *Union* was the organ of the party out of power. When, however, a year after the new administration came in, an attempt was made to remove the causes of sectional irritation and suspicion growing out of slavery by the adoption of the compromise measures, it was thought the interests of the south needed a daily newspaper advocate at the Nation's capital. A special paper for a special cause was not a new idea in Washington journalism. Only three years before, the *National Era,* recognized as the organ of the abolitionists, was established and became the national organ. But the *Era* was only a weekly, while the paper now started, the *Southern Press,* was a daily.[1] Moreover, it was published in accordance with resolutions adopted at a meeting of southern members of congress. In a little more than two years the publication ceased, as the funds of the editors were exhausted. It is quite apparent from the valedictory, that the main reliance for means to support such an undertaking was contributions from friends. At the outset, the veteran in the field of daily newspapers, the *Intelligencer,* regarded the new venture as so uncertain that it could not refrain from exclaiming, "One would have thought that the graves of similar enterprises, which are strewed within the compass of the city, would have been a warning enough to the most adventurous against so perilous an undertaking as establishing a daily paper to be published here." [2] A few months later the comment might have been repeated, as the *Constitution,* also a daily, appeared.[3] Its mission was directly opposed to that of the *Southern Press,* as it sought to express the feeling, which was so general after the adoption of the compromise measures, that the issue of slavery was now removed forever from politics. The formation of a union party was advocated with all sectional lines disregarded. As it proved at first, when attempts were made to enforce the fugitive slave law, and later on when the Kansas-Nebraska bill came up, slavery was not a dead issue. However, the *Constitution* had but a short life. If it had lived until the following spring, there would have been seven daily newspapers published at the Nation's capital — an unequalled record. For it was in the spring of 1851 that the *American Daily Telegraph,* an evening paper, appeared.[1] The brief and uncertain career of the *Telegraph* was not due to the notions of its projectors, original and unusual for a Washington daily paper, although not uncommon for a weekly paper, as to the function and scope of such a publication, but rather to the failure to adhere to them.[2] For it was proposed, and for a time actually carried out, to publish a cheap non-partisan paper that was to be devoted to the interests of the community. As the price charged for the paper was two cents, the adjective "cheap" was only relative. Since the short-lived *Daily Bee,* which appeared in the summer of 1845, no penny paper had been published in Washington, and it was not until the following year, when the *Star* was established, that Washington had a penny daily — nineteen years after the first venture of that sort in this country had begun its career in New York city. In no other city would a newspaper prospectus, as that of the *Telegraph,* have been regarded as unusual. For in no other city except Washington would it have been possible to induce men to go into a risky enterprise, like starting a daily paper, without reasonable expectation of support from the community.[3] But in Washington great dailies had come into existence and had passed away, with hardly a consciousness of the community life about them. Even in the case of the *Intelligencer* that had grown up with the city, while it was always a consistent and sympathetic interpreter and advocate of District interests, yet it never lost sight of its national audience, and naturally to such a vision local matters bulked small. It was not long before the owners of the *Telegraph* yielded to the current Washington tendency, and gave up the original policy and became a political partisan. To this lapse was attributed the failure of the enterprise, by the surviving owner, Joseph B. Tate. This experience only served to strengthen his conviction, that what the town needed was a cheap non-partisan and local paper. He announced the purpose to supply such a need.[1] In less than a month after the *Telegraph* came to an end, after a career of nearly two years, Mr. Tate began the issue of a daily evening penny paper, the *Evening Star*.[2] In the course of two years, as the paper won a place for itself in the community, the original 7 × 9 sheet was enlarged.[3] This was done too at a period — a change in the national administration — which was the most trying in Washington during all the years, when tenure in office found its only advocates in the defeated party.

---

[1] *Intelligencer,* May 9, 1849. The sum of $1250 was divided between the two city orphan asylums.

[2] Library of congress file, April 7, 1847–June 20, 1849. The publisher was Charles W. Fenton, while the editor was Worthington G. Snethen, a member of the bar who was then completing the first collection of the laws of the district relating to slavery. It was published the following year in New York in pamphlet form by the A. and F. Antislavery Society with the title "The Black Code of the District of Columbia."

[3] From June 13, 1849 to Aug. 27, 1853. Publishers Gideon and Co. sold Aug. 27, 1853, to Wm. M. Barwell, who discontinued the daily and issued a weekly that during its brief existence advocated state rights.

---

[1] Edited by Ellwood Fisher and Edwin de Leon. Printed by A. Sage and H. H. Heath, June 18, 1850–Aug. 9, 1852.

[2] June 18, 1850.

[3] *Intelligencer,* Dec. 17, 1850. Robert Farnham and Co., publishers.

---

[1] Vol. 1, No. 1, March 24, 1851. Last issue Nov. 18, 1852. The first editor was Thomas C. Connolly and James Wimer and Thomas McGill, publishers. Then the firm was dissolved and Connolly was associated with John L. Smith and then with Joseph B. Tate. At last Tate was left alone.

[2] *American Daily Telegraph,* March 24, 1851.

[3] The abnormal conditions are sufficiently indicated by comparison with such a place as Baltimore, where in 1851 the population was about 170,000 as compared with about 41,000 in Washington. But in the latter town six daily papers were published, while in the former there were five.

There were, however, conditions that were helpful in establishing a newspaper that was first of all distinctively local. During the decade prior to 1850 the increase in the city's population had been three times greater than for the ten years before 1840. The city kept on growing after 1850, so that the increase was still greater ten years later.[4] Then too, as the founder of the *Star* declared, the Washington public was practically without a local paper, as the greater dailies published in their midst had little or no interest in city affairs and local news was given but scant attention. It was quite different with the *Sun* and the *Clipper*, penny independent morning papers of Baltimore, that printed each day Washington local news gathered by their own correspondents. To this attention to local news, as well as to their cheapness, was attributed their extensive circulation in Washington.[1] Before the close of the first year of the *Star*, its direction passed into the hands of W. D. Wallach, whose brother, Richard Wallach, was then marshal of the District. But it was a change in management, not in policy. Mr. Wallach had been in active newspaper work in Washington for some years.[2] He was correspondent of the *Richmond Enquirer* while Thomas Ritchie was editor. When Mr. Ritchie became the editor of the *Union*, Mr. Wallach joined the staff of that paper. He was an active, bustling man with the faculty of writing what people were interested in reading.[3] He was quite the opposite of Father Ritchie, as men loved to call him, who, two years before Mr. Wallach took hold of the *Star*, had retired after forty-seven years of active newspaper work.[4] Mr. Ritchie had not had the influence in Washington that he wielded for so many years in his own state, and Mr. Wallach attributed it to his lack of capacity for political management. The slight figure in the fading fashion of small-clothes, hurrying from his home on Lafayette Park to the *Union* office, after laborious hours in his library, his cultivated tastes, his remarkable capacity for work with no relaxation, except when he read his favorite Virgil or his Bible, made him a distinct individuality, even in such a society as he found at Washington.[5] Upon his retirement, in 1851, before the beginning of the Pierce campaign, Mr. Ritchie sold the *Union* to Andrew J. Donelson, the adopted son of Andrew Jackson, who had recently returned from Europe, where he had represented the United States at the courts of Prussia and Germany. Associated with him was Robert Armstrong, of the *Nashville Union*. The purchase, however, did not include the building.[1] Not only did the *Union* continue, under the new management, to be the organ of the party, but some months before Pierce was elected president, Robert Armstrong was elected printer of both houses, as the Democrats had regained control of congress. In comparison with former periods, the number of minor newspaper ventures from 1848 to 1852 was unusually few.[2] The overwhelming defeat of the Whig party in the presidential election of 1852 had more of personal significance perhaps in Washington than in any other portion of the country. For both the candidates on the ticket were residents of the city: General Winfield Scott, the commander-in-chief of the army, and William A. Graham, the secretary of the navy.[3] When the time came to arrange for the inauguration of Franklin Pierce, no division appeared in the ranks of the Democratic party. Jackson Hall was thought to be large enough, and there it was planned to have the ball.

---

[1] *American Daily Telegraph*, Nov. 8 and 18, 1852.

[2] Established by Joseph B. Tate, July 14, 1852. Purchased by W. D. Wallach and W. H. Hope, July 5, 1853. Mr. Wallach became the sole owner, March 24, 1855. The first publication office was at 8th and D streets, presumably Mr. Tate's printing establishment, and then later at the southwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Eleventh streets.

[3] *The Star*, July 3, 1854.

[4] The figures are 1830, 18,533; 1840, 23,364; 1850, 40,001; 1860, 61,122.

---

[1] *American Telegraph*, March 24, 1851.

[2] When Mr. Wallach sold the *Star* in 1867 (see issue of Oct. 31, 1867, and of Dec. 3, 1892) to Crosby S. Noyes, in charge of the editorial department, C. B. Baker, the manager of the business department, S. H. Kauffmann, formerly a newspaper publisher in Ohio, George W. Adams, a Washington newspaper correspondent, and A. R. Shepherd, he stated he had been connected with the newspaper press for twenty-nine years.

[3] Journalism in America, p. 257.

[4] *The Union*, April 15, 1851.

[5] *The Star*, July 5, 1854. Obituary Sketch of Mr. Ritchie, by W. D. Wallach. See also Journalism in the United States, p. 268. Mr. Ritchie's Washington residence was 1607 H Street, of which he was probably the first occupant.

---

[1] A few months after the sale was made Ritchie and Heiss disposed of the building at auction. The purchaser was Wm. H. Winder and the price $11,700. *Intelligencer*, Aug. 9 and 13, 1851.

[2] The following are mentioned in the *Intelligencer:* the *National Monument*. Weekly. Profits to go to the Washington monument. James A. Pickett, editor, formerly Fourth Auditor and Chargé d'affaires in Peru. (*Intelligencer*, April 26, 1851.) Suspended for lack of funds. (Same, Oct. 17, 1851.) The *Christian Statesman*. Weekly, devoted to colonization, literature, etc. R. R. Gurley and D. R. Goodloe, publishers. (The same, June 16, 1851.) The *Metropolitan*. Weekly literary and miscellaneous family paper. Lucian Laselle, publisher, Mrs. N. P. Laselle, literary editor. (The same, July 29, 1851; *The Star*, May 17, 1855.) The *Cotton Plant*. Weekly. C. G. Baylor, editor. (*Intelligencer*, April 27, 1852.) The *Aerial Reporter*, No. 14, by Rufus Porter in the interests of a balloon being built by Mr. Porter. (The same, Dec. 29, 1852.)

[3] General Scott lived in the Menou house or Chain building, now the site of 1321 H Street, while Mr. Graham lived on the same street but farther to the west between 17th and 18th streets.

A short time before the 4th of March, the president elect and his wife lost their son, an only child, in a railroad accident, and so the ball was abandoned.[1] In other particulars the program usual on such an occasion was carried out. While the politics of the administration were unchanged, yet adjustments followed in the publication of daily newspapers. A few months before Pierce was elected, the democratic congress went back to the former practice, of each house electing a printer and paying him according to a schedule of rates fixed by law, instead of giving out the work by contract. The lowest bidder no longer got the work, but the man who could muster the most votes. While as has been pointed out, there had always been an intimate connection between newspapers published in Washington and public printing, yet the experience of the six years the contract system was in effect shows that newspaper enterprises were possible without such aid. For while during the first two years of this system, which ended at the close of the Polk administration in 1849, the newspapers decreased in number, yet for the rest of the period more dailies were published than ever before. The modified rates fixed by the law of 1852 no doubt then and for some years later fairly represented current prices, yet the profits soon became swollen by the great increase in the quantity of printing ordered. The rates were not again changed, and so each year, as the volume of public printing grew, the profits also grew, and so did the tendency to treat them as a fund available for political uses.

The scope of the political uses expanded. The printing of one of the houses of congress was found to be sufficient to keep the administration Washington newspaper organ going. The printer of the other house, as well as the one chosen to do the executive printing, was expected to assist party newspapers in other towns to defray the expense in circulating documents and render timely aid in close districts.[2] This new method of dealing with the Washington newspaper situation was adopted early in the Pierce administration. As soon as the act of 1852 became a law, both houses elected the proprietor of the *Union* to do the printing. That paper became the organ of the administration. Then six months after the inauguration, the *Washington Sentinel,* a Democratic daily, was started, and when the new congress met, the senate elected the publisher of the new paper as its printer,[1] while the house reelected the owner of the *Union.* Unlike the *Southern Press* of the Fillmore administration and the *States* of the Buchanan term, the *Sentinel* had no source of living except the profits of the public printing, and when the next congress passed it by in the election of printers, then it no longer appeared as a daily. After lingering along for a time as a weekly, it was finally laid away in the Washington newspaper cemetery. In accordance with the new policy it had no successor. For the rest of the Pierce term the organs of the two parties, the *Union* and the *Intelligencer,* retained their places. But the Know Nothings had their paper, the *American Organ.* The *Star,* a purely local newspaper, completed the list of dailies, four instead of the five, as compared with the number that occupied the Washington field during the Polk administration. While the senate from congress to congress, through the eight years this public printing system lasted, continued to elect the proprietor of the *Union* to do its printing, the house began the practice of choosing men who were not owners of Washington newspapers or of printing plants. In fact, due partially to the growth in the volume of printed matter, this work ceased to be done even at the *Union* office, as the proprietor, like the official printers, sublet his contract, and had nothing more to do with the work than to take his profit of from twenty to thirty-three per cent

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Feb. 4, 1853.

[2] After having the work done by paying the bills of the subcontracting printers, it was estimated that the official printers had a fund of

---

between two and three hundred thousand dollars, a good part of which they were expected to use for political purposes. 36th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 205, Jan. 12, 1850.

[1] The file of the *Washington Sentinel* is Sept. 14, 1853–March 25, 1855. Then weekly until publication ceased, Aug. 19, 1856. Beverly Tucker was the publisher. William Overton and Charles Maurice Smith were the editors.

of the total amount paid by the government.[1] In three years after the contract system was abolished practically all of the government printing was done at the establishment of Cornelius Wendell, who at times held the official position of printer to the house. In 1856 Wendell erected the largest printing plant the city had ever seen, which, some five years later, was purchased by the government when congress decided to do its own printing.[2] While the income of the *Union* as the administration organ continued to be assured, changes occurred in its management. For Andrew J. Donelson soon gave up his interest in the paper, and then Robert Armstrong died. Another prominent Tennessean, A. O. P. Nicholson, who subsequently served a term of two years in the senate, took over the Armstrong interests. Associated with him was John W. Forney, who was at that time the clerk of the house.[3] The brilliant young Virginia editor, Roger A. Pryor, joined the staff of the *Union,* and began his career as a writer on a city paper, while from the pen of Caleb Cushing, the attorney-general, came editorials that set forth the policy of the administration.[4] When the *American Organ* appeared in the fall of 1854, it was not the first time the American party had a newspaper devoted to its interests published in Washington. Now, however, the party had come into control of the city government. For only a few months before, the Democratic candidate for mayor, John A. Maury, had gone down in defeat before the tidal wave that had borne into the chief office of the city the nominee of the Know Nothing party. The victors made a clean sweep. They filled the city offices with their adherents, following in this particular the current usage.

---

[1] As the committee of investigation stated in 1860, of the eight persons elected printers by congress since 1852, but three had the requisite buildings and materials.

[2] This building at the southwest corner of North Capitol and H streets, forming a part of the government printing plant to-day, was over 240 feet long, 60 feet wide and four stories high. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. XI, p. 372.

[3] Men and Things at Washington, pp. 135 and 142.

[4] Reminiscences of Peace and War, Mrs. Roger A. Pryor, pp. 5 and 26.

They also went beyond that, as a majority of the members of the school board were changed.[1] Then the party was supplied with a newspaper by the issue of the *Daily American Organ.*[2] While the new paper had a struggling existence, yet it was given all the aid that was to be had from the city government. The announcement appeared in its columns that it was the official city organ. It was given the printing of the council proceedings that for more than half a century had appeared in the *Intelligencer*, and had been duly paid for from the city treasury.[3] In all the changes that had come in the course of its existence, the *Intelligencer* had never before been made to feel the financial effects of a political defeat in its local relations. But it was not the first warning that its business was melting away. For even before the Know Nothing party organ was published, it had lost its place as having the largest circulation of any local paper.[4] It may be presumed that the same cause which freed in an unusual degree the daily field from competition had an influence in preventing even driblets of patronage finding a way to minor publications. At any rate, during the Pierce administration the number of these ventures was less than in any similar period.[5] As has been stated, the overthrow of the Whig party in the national election in 1852 was preceded a few months by its defeat in the Washington municipal election. At that time the Democrats, aided by Whig votes, elected John W. Maury, mayor, defeating Walter Lenox, whom the Whigs had named for a second term. Two years later, reflecting the general trend, especially in the northern section of the country, the Know Nothing party in that period of uncertainty when the Whig party was going to pieces carried the city elections. Maury, who was a candidate for reëlection, was defeated by John T. Towers. The newly elected mayor was not a stranger in the city. For years he had been at the head of a book and job printing office. As indicating his former political affiliation, he had been the publisher of a daily paper, the *Whig Standard*.[1] In 1852, two years before his election as mayor, he was appointed by congress the first superintendent of public printing. The Know Nothing administration had been in office about a year when there was a repetition, in kind at least, of the Pope stone episode, but perhaps more spectacular in effect. It was nothing less than the seizure by the Know Nothing party of the control of the Washington Monument Society, replacing the board of managers and taking possession of the books and property of the society. Advantage was taken of one of the money-raising devices of the society. Membership certificates were secured by a large number of persons on the payment of one dollar. When a newspaper notice appeared, announcing a meeting of the society at the city hall, although it was not signed by the secretary or authorized by the society, a great many came, and they were largely new members. An election was held, although it was not the usual time. A new board of managers, recognized as representative of those in sympathy with the Know Nothing party, replaced the old, and the thing was done. The ousted board protested in vain. The affair was the sensation of the day.[2]

---

[1] *The Star*, Nov. 3, 1854.

[2] First issue, Nov. 13, 1854. The last issue was apparently about two and one-half years later. (*Star*, May 28, 1857.)

[3] Ordinance, Nov. 20, 1855.

[4] *Star*, July 3, 1854.

[5] The minor papers mentioned in the *Star* as having actually come out are as follows: *The Truth.* James Robertson, editor. (*Star*, Sept. 12, 1854.) *Saturday Evening Mail.* J. Patrick and Charles W. Denison. (The same, May 17, 1855.) The *Washington Wochenblatt.* A. and M. Gross. (The same, Jan. 28, 1856.)

As the term of Mr. Towers drew to an end, in the early summer of 1856, the Know Nothing party and their opponents, for there were no other parties in local politics at that period, prepared for the coming contest. Through the influence of the Know Nothing party in congress a law was passed which placed the foreign born in Washington, who had taken out naturalization papers six months prior to the election, in the same class with native-born citizens, reaching their majority in the same period, and who were not permitted to vote at the next succeeding election. The law further provided for two election precincts in each ward.[1] The opponents of the Know Nothing party threw aside all party affiliations. Democrats, free soilers and Republicans united on Dr. William B. Magruder as their candidate. He was a practising physician and had long been identified with city affairs as member of the board of health and the city council. In spite of the union of forces, the fusion candidate's majority over that of Silas H. Hill, the leader of the Know Nothing forces,[2] was only 13 out of a total of 5841 votes.[3] The parties were so evenly divided that Dr. Magruder ran ahead of his ticket, and the city council was controlled by his opponents. That fall the Know Nothing party put a national ticket in the field, but it received only the eight electoral votes of Maryland. The forces opposed to the Democrats were further divided between the Republican party, then making its first appearance at a national election, and the free-soil party. The election of Buchanan followed.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Nov. 7, 1843. It was noted that Mr. Towers was the sixth printer to fill the office of mayor. The others were Daniel Rapine, Roger C. Weightman, Joseph Gales, Peter Force and W. W. Seaton. *Star*, June 8 and 9, 1854.

[2] *Intelligencer*, May 29 and 30, 1855. Also History of the Washington National Monument, p. 52. 57th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 224, Feb. 6, 1903. The control of the property was voluntarily restored in the course of three years, and then the Monument Society adopted the precaution of securing a charter from congress.

The defeat in the mayoralty election of 1856 did not end the career of the Know Nothing party in Washington. For the following year, when an election to fill some city offices was held, a gang of fourteen election strikers or plug-uglies came over from Baltimore, and gathering in their train the disorderly element in the city, proceeded to the polling-place at the Northern Liberty Market, on the south side of Mount Vernon Square, between 7th and 8th streets. The anti-Know Nothing voters were driven away. The police were defied and were helpless. The words of Mayor Magruder were disregarded. There was no militia organization.

---

[1] Stats., XI, 15, May 16, 1856. Also The *Star*, May 17, 1856.

[2] A few days before the election Mr. Hill resigned as president of the Washington Gaslight Co. *The Star*, May 30, 1856.

[3] The same, June 3, 1856.

For the first time an appeal was made to the president of the United States to quell disorder in the District. For the first time, the exclusive authority of the government was exercised in this particular. Without calling on the governor of a state, or asking permission from any source, the president of the United States, as commander-in-chief of the army and navy, directed to be sent to the scene of disorder a detachment of marines from the Marine Barracks in the city. When this force of one hundred and ten soldiers arrived in the vicinity of 7th and K streets, Mayor Magruder went to the polls, which he found had been closed by order of the election officers, although the hour fixed by law had not arrived.

They declined to open the polls, and then the mayor called for the troops. The crowd was not impressed. There was no thought that the guns which the marines carried would be used. The mistake was soon realized. Advancing to the corner of 7th and K streets, the marines took possession of an old cannon that had been put in position, and then proceeding towards the crowd, they were greeted with derisive shouts. A shower of stones fell about them, and some pistol shots were fired. Then the order was given to the soldiers to fire, and seven men in the crowd, mostly spectators, were killed and twenty-one were wounded. The disturbers then disappeared as if by magic, and the revolt against authority was at an end, but not the apprehensions of the citizens, which, however, proved groundless.[1] As the result of the voting in this and other precincts, the union or anti-Know Nothing ticket was successful.

The immediate outcome of an occurrence of such an unusual character in a peaceful, orderly community like Washington was to direct attention to the police protection. Its inadequacy was recognized both by the city council and by congress. The city council was the first to act, and some six months after the election riot an addition of ten men was made to the day force, bringing up the total to twenty-seven men.[1] The following June the mayoralty election was quiet and uneventful, although it was feared violent measures would be adopted. James G. Berret, representing the Democrats and anti-Know Nothings, received a majority of votes over Richard Wallach, the independent candidate.[2] The new mayor at once informed the council that the city police force of twenty-seven men and the congressional force of thirty men were entirely inadequate, and urged an increase to one hundred men.[3] The response of the council was apparently political, as an ordinance was passed, authorizing an addition of only ten men, which, however, was not made.[4] In the meantime the subject was discussed in the senate, after hearing a report from the District committee which, while admitting that the inefficiency of the police was due in part to its feebleness, yet a more obvious cause, it was asserted, was the practice of the city authorities in appointing the most active political partisans. In congress it was thought highly reprehensible to use police appointments in partisan politics. Yet the mayor only followed the practice that was general in the government service, where a change in the politics of the administration was followed by changes in the employés. As was said on the floor of the house at this period, the clerks in the government service in Washington, estimated then to number 1000, expect to leave the city at the end of four years.[5] At each biennial city election, from 1852 to 1858, when Democrat followed Whig and Know Nothing succeeded Democrat, and then came a fusion candidate, followed in turn by a Democrat, the police force had a chief who served for two years, and then gave way to the next partisan.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 1, 15, 23 and 30, 1857. *Congressional Globe*, p. 2359, May 26, 1858.

---

[1] Ordinance, Jan. 7, 1858.

[2] *The Star*, June 8 and 14, 1858.

[3] The same, June 14, 1858. Both Berret and Wallach were lawyers. The latter was the first to hold the office of attorney or corporation counsel, which was created by the ordinance of June 30, 1824.

[4] Ordinance, June 30, 1858. See names of members of police force in list of city officers appended to Laws.

[5] *Congressional Globe*, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., House, p. 2356, May 24, 1858.

Then the new chief and the mayor saw to it that the active workers in the last election were rewarded in appointments on the force. What was done in the case of the police was the practice throughout the city government.

The change in the names in the list of those holding the offices of marshal of the District, of the District attorney and of the city postmaster, all presidential appointments, were coincident with the opening of a new national administration, especially if it meant a change in party control.

However, not much time was wasted by the senate in commenting upon a practice that was practically universal. It was proposed to change the Washington police political patronage from local to federal control. In recommending that the Auxiliary Guard be enlarged, the senate District committee revived the plan that only the feeling against Tyler defeated in 1842, by urging that the power of appointing members of the Guard be transferred from the mayor to the captain of the guard, who was to be appointed by the president and confirmed by the senate instead of receiving his appointment from the mayor.[1] A measure of this sort was adopted by the senate. The house did nothing, although William H. Seward and Stephen A. Douglas both declared on the floor of the senate during the discussion, that the streets of Washington were so unsafe, on account of rough and violent characters, that residents avoided as far as possible going out at night. Perhaps the remedy proposed was not regarded as likely to reach the root of the matter, as under existing custom the appointees of the president were partisans, just as was the case with the mayors of Washington.

At the next session, congress dealt with the Washington police question. But no change in methods was made. More men were provided. The auxiliary guard was increased from thirty to fifty men. The city council made a similar addition to the thirty men on the day force. The force of one hundred men was proportionately about the same provision as made by the city of Baltimore. However, as stated by the senate

---

[1] *Congressional Globe,* 35th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen., April 1, 1858.

District committee in the report already referred to, the population of 60,000 covered a wider area than the 260,000 of Baltimore, where the police force numbered 400. When the civil war broke out, no change had been made.

The salaries of the night force were paid by the government, and those of the day force by the city. While the city supplied the uniforms of both forces, congress provided heat and light for the city-built guard-houses. The yearly charge against the city was greater than that against the government. But the revenue derived from the police cases went into the city treasury.[1] When the small frame structure on Centre Market Square, that had been in use for a guard-house for some twenty years, was replaced in the fall of 1869 by a larger and more suitable structure planned for such a use, and erected on the south side of Louisiana Avenue between 9th and 10th streets, the cost came from the city treasury.[2] This building, known as the Central Guard-house, was of brick, two stories in height, and had a bell tower. It was used as a temporary prison for lawbreakers, and a refuge for those in need of shelter, as well as a court-room, where the sittings of the police magistrates were held. It was not long after the day force was established, in 1851, that charges of corrupt practices on the part of police officers were heard, and especially giving protection to gamblers. It was thought that the law enacted in 1830 against gambling was not enforced. Yet before the day police was created the prevalence of this vice, its unbridled course, was attributed by the mayor, Walter Lenox, to defects in this law and not to lack of enforcement.[3] While the law provided fines and even a penitentiary sentence for those convicted of keeping gaming establishments, yet the mayor explained, as the law officers were without the power to enter suspected places, it was difficult to get the proof. Whatever the cause, the law was not enforced. It stood on the statute books thirty years before the first case was brought.[1] Mayor Lenox did not call attention to an unknown condition. Seven years before, a society had been formed, as the result of a public meeting, to stamp out this evil.[2] But nothing was accomplished. The city council, in the course of three decades, passed but one law, and that was intended to put a stop to the activities of runners for gambling places.[3] Nor was anything done when a committee of the board of aldermen went to what was suspected to be the root of the evil and recommended a law providing punishment for any police magistrate or police officer who accepted money in consideration of extending protection to gamblers.[4] Perhaps with the purpose of prodding the city fathers into some action, while this measure was pending, one of the city papers, under the title, "Gambling hells," declared that "Pennsylvania Avenue is positively a disgrace to Christendom. It abounds with sinks of iniquity, where human crime is as coolly planned as in a robber's cave. The city administration is praised for the suppression of rowdyism, but it should now take up the gambling evil."[5] As has been seen, the movements which sought to restrain and do away with gambling and drinking and to free the police from evil influences rose and then fell away into inaction. But the contest with current evils had many phases. The same year the antigambling movement was started, the Washington City Bible Society, the second established in Washington, and which had been in existence since 1828, but had not been active in its work for several years, was revived.[6] The custom of making a house-to-house canvass, for the purpose of learning where Bibles were lacking, was resumed, and in

---

[1] *The Star* March 26, 1859. Stats., 11, 421 and 12, 146. Ordinances, Aug. 14, 1858, Aug. 10, 1859, July 13, 1860.

[2] *The Star*, Nov. 26, 1860.

[3] In Laws, 1851.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 30, 1860. As it was the first case the plea of hardship was made by the convicted men on that account.

[2] The same, May 7 and 13, 1844.

[3] Robert S. Hickman, known as Colonel Beau Hickman for nearly forty years, from 1833 to 1873, a unique type of dead-beat about the hotels and other resorts of the city, was popularly supposed to get a part of his living by bringing customers to gambling places. Life of Beau Hickman, 1879.

[4] *The Star*, Oct. 4, 1859.

[5] *The States*, Oct. 12, 1859.

[6] Seventy-six Years of the Washington City Bible Society. Washington, 1904.

1847 the fourth survey of the city was completed, and before the war began two more were made. While a fifth visitation was going on in 1852, some sixty men met at the Medical or, as it was then called, Masonic Hall, at the northeast corner of 10th and E streets northwest, in response to a published call to young men of the different Protestant denominations to consider a plan for organizing a Young Men's Christian Association.[1] The call for the meeting was due to the enthusiasm of three young men, William C. Langdon, Thomas Duncan and William J. Rhees. In the course of a week ninety-two members were enrolled, and an organization effected,[2] making the sixth association in this country.

Two years later, as the result of the suggestion of W. C. Langdon, the first convention of the Young Men's Christian Associations of the United States was held. At this meeting in Buffalo a central committee was created, with headquarters in Washington, to serve as a sort of clearing-house for association methods. At this time a meeting of representatives of various churches of Georgetown was held for the purpose of organizing an association, but this was not done.[3] The Washington association became a centre of active evangelical work. Mission sabbath schools were organized in various sections of the city, Bible classes were formed, while the city prison and asylum were visited. At the headquarters of the association [4] were to be found a library and reading-room, an employment bureau and a directory of boarding-houses.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 9 and 11, 1852. Also Record of Fifty Years.

[2] The first officers and directors were: president, A. H. Lawrence; recording secretary, W. J. Rhees; corresponding secretary, W. C. Langdon; treasurer, M. H. Miller. Directors nominated by the different churches: Baptist, J. W. Clarke, G. W. Dutton, Thomas Brooks and R. Smallwood; Episcopal, T. M. Hanson, C. W. Schreiner, Thomas Duncan and C. Dusenbury; Methodist, Charles Pierson, A. B. Johnson and George H. B. White; Presbyterian, Dr. J. S. Mackie, J. T. Cochrane, J. C. Whitwell and O. C. Wight.

[3] *The Star*, Aug. 9, 1854.

[4] First on the third floor of a building on the east side of 7th Street adjoining the corner of E, and in 1858 in the Parker building on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 6th and 7th streets.

While the public response in appreciation of these unselfish efforts was not on the broad and generous scale of later years, still when, in 1857, the expenses of the association had exceeded the income, the ladies of the various churches united in giving a Union Festival for its benefit.

This union of sympathy and efforts of the city churches was not the first joint movement; for, in the early forties, annual gatherings of the various Sunday schools of the city began to be a feature of that work. Frequently this was one of the ways of observing the Fourth of July. On such occasions, after a parade through the streets, the march ended at some church, or perhaps at the capitol grounds, or a shaded grove near the city. Similar affairs came to mark the closing of the public schools, when the children marched to the Smithsonian grounds, where premiums and prizes were awarded for the year's work.

Although the parade of little children through the streets is only another evidence of village conditions, yet in fact the increase in population was making itself felt. It was a period of growing pains. For at this time, after an interval of two decades, the subject of law reform had been revived. Since the attempt made in 1832, that failed, to have congress substitute for the great mass of ancient laws a code adapted for modern needs, nothing had been done. But now a new phase was presented. Congress was asked to reorganize the judiciary, abolish the existing court and create three courts, chancery and probate, common pleas and appeals, leaving the criminal court unchanged.[1] For it was declared that the existing court was a part of "an antiquated, tedious, intricate and expensive system, behind the progress of the age and the wants of our community." Then it was asked that the judges be elected by the people. In the opinion of the senate judiciary committee, the aim of the memorialists was the removal of the judges. After commending the learning and labor of the judges, the bill was reported adversely. However, the committee submitted a resolution, providing for a revision and amendment of the laws.

---

[1] *Congressional Globe*, May 13, 1850, p. 984; also 31st Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 185, Aug. 22, 1850. Butler report.

During the discussion in the senate of these memorials, it was asserted that the conduct of the judiciary had become intolerable to the people, and the last crowning act, it was declared, was the suspension from practice of Henry May, the son of Dr. Frederick May, in consequence of a remark made by him in open court, in criticism of the action of the judges. In the course of two or three years after his disbarment in 1850, Mr. May, who had removed his residence to Baltimore, was sent to congress, and then renewed his efforts against the judges.[1] While it was the first time the court as a whole had been assailed, yet some thirteen years before, in 1837, two members of the bar, who found the infirmities of temper displayed by Judge Buckner Thurston more than they could bear, went to congress with their grievance. An investigation was made by the house judiciary committee. A series of questions were sent to various persons, and in response sworn statements were returned. The testimony was reported to the house without recommendation, and that was the end of the matter.[2] The scenes thus reported to have taken place in court, and the relations which the accused judge had with his associates on the bench and the members of the bar, reveal a condition that seems incredible in the modern conception of the calm and dignity of court proceedings. While it is quite clear that Judge Thurston's irritable temperament and his lack of control made him subject to violent outbreaks, yet it is also apparent that Richard A. Coxe and William L. Brent, who brought the charges, were so constituted as to arouse and stir the judge. Just a few weeks before the charges were brought, Mr. Coxe, in conducting a case, made some observation that wrought Judge Thurston to such a degree of passion that, after calling Mr. Coxe a scoundrel and a poltron, he rushed from the bench to the floor of the court-room and dared the lawyer to go outside and fight. On several previous occasions, the memorialist asserted, the judge from the bench had invited members of the bar to a personal encounter.

---

[1] *The Star*, July 13, 1854. Reminiscences of Walter S. Cox, Washington Law Reporter, p. 501, Aug. 8, 1895.

[2] 24th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 327, March 3, 1837.

At that time the chief judge, Judge Cranch, a man of kindly, peaceful nature, had for more than a year past declined to have anything to do with his associate outside of their official duties. This was due to a sneering remark made by Judge Thurston to Judge Cranch while on the bench, that the latter encouraged litigation because he made money out of reporting the cases. Naturally Judge Cranch resented this imputation upon his motive for the public-spirited labors by which the decisions of the court, from its foundation in 1801 down to 1840, were preserved.[1] Judge Cranch believed, however, that all these ebullitions were due to mental infirmity, and that indeed was Judge Thurston's own idea, as John Quincy Adams records in his memoirs.[2] There was no doubt of his ability and attainments. He was a good Latin scholar, spoke French and Italian, was an accomplished mathematician, and well read in the law. At that time he was seventy-five years of age, and he lived eight years longer. In the last years he looked, "like a skeleton in a loose bag of skin, grim, stern, irritable." [3]

When the career of Judge Thurston ended with his death, in the thirty-fifth year of his service on the District bench, the *Intelligencer*, in a sketch of his life, said that he "was a gentleman in the best sense of that word, and his superior abilities and classical attainments, combined with his urbane manners in private life, made his company instructive and pleasing." [4] The city council paused long enough in its legislative labors to place on record its appreciation of a life, "distinguished as well for his literary and scientific attainments as for legal learning, great abilities and sterling integrity." [5] The bar also placed on record an appreciative estimate of the dead jurist's attainments and character.[1] The vacancy caused by the passing away of this most unique figure was filled by President Polk with the appointment of James Dunlop, who had been for seven years judge of the criminal court. As both the chief judge and Judge Morsell were citizens of the District at the time of their appointment, the bench was then for the first and also the last time filled entirely by District citizens. In place of Judge Dunlop the president appointed as judge of the criminal court, Thomas H. Crawford of Pennsylvania, who then held the office of commissioner of Indian affairs, having previously served two terms as representative in congress. Judge Crawford was then fifty-nine years of age, and held the position for eighteen years, or until his death in 1863. The judge, according to a contemporary, "was a fairly good lawyer, but had the peculiarity of always thinking his decisions rested on stronger grounds than any the counsel had suggested. He was a sharp-featured old gentleman with a bald head, somewhat shaped like that of a chicken." [2] When Judge Dunlop came to the circuit court in 1845, he was fifty-two years of age. He was indeed a junior, for of his two associates, Judge Cranch was seventy-six years of age and Judge Morsell seventy. The latter served forty-eight years. After his retirement from the bench when the court was abolished in 1863, he lived seven years, reaching the advanced age of ninety-five. He is described as "a plodding, patient and industrious judge. He lived a very secluded life and never left his home, except for court or church."[3] When Judge Cranch died in 1855, an unequalled judicial term of fifty-four years came to an end. For the last six years of his life, owing to increasing deafness as well as the infirmities of age, he was unable to perform any of the duties of his office.[4] The vacancy caused by his death was filled by the transfer of James Dunlop, associate judge, to the chief judgeship. President Buchanan named, in Dunlop's place, William M. Merrick, who a year before had removed his home from Frederick, Md., to Washington.

---

[1] The publication in six volumes of the manuscript reports was not begun until 1852, three years before the death of the author.

[2] Vol. 8, p. 31, June 10, 1828.

[3] Reminiscences of W. S. Cox, p. 500.

[4] Sept. 1, 1845.

[5] Resolution, Sept. 2, 1845.

---

[1] Hayward and Hazelton's C. C. Reports, Vol. 1, appendix.

[2] Reminiscences, W. S. Cox, p. 500.

[3] The same.

[4] *The Star*, Jan. 4, 1855.

As the changes of the years wrought their work with the venerable members of the court, the clerk, William Brent, was not passed by, as he died in 1848, after a service of forty-three years.[1] His place was taken by his deputy, John A. Smith, whose term ended only with the life of the court.

Although there is no doubt of a personal animus in the court reform movement of 1850, at the same time the defects in the system of procedure resulted in hardship and expense, if not actual denial of justice. Judge Thurston was especially impatient of the law's slowness and delays, but he had been dead five years before the reform agitation took shape. While the venerable chief judge was even then unable to perform his duties, yet such was the respect for his character and regard for his services that those who advocated the plan which would legislate the court out of existence always took care to express the hope that provision would be made for Judge Cranch.

At the same time, the learning and ability of the court was defended, although the assertion was made in a memorial of citizens that since the infirmity of Judge Cranch, the court had lost the confidence of the people.[2] While the recommendation of the senate judiciary committee in 1850, that the laws be revised, was not acted upon at that time, yet five years later this mode of relief was advocated by Henry May, who had been credited with being foremost in bringing about the agitation for the abolition of the circuit court. The resolution offered in the house by Mr. May was adopted, authorizing a joint committee to have the laws codified. The work was completed in 1857 by Robert Ould and William B. B. Cross, but when submitted, as the resolution required, to the verdict of a District popular vote, the people were unwilling to accept the changes proposed and the code was rejected.[3] It was not until a new judicial system and a new practice were adopted, when the circuit court was replaced in 1863 by the Supreme Court of the District, that the old-time practice was done away with when each case had three terms — the appearance, the imparlance and trial terms — requiring nearly a year to get a judgment even when a case was uncontested.[1] To defects in the law as well as the tendencies of juries was attributed the reduction from murder to manslaughter in punishment for homicides.[2] During the ten years prior to 1860, while there were a number of homicides, only two executions took place.[3] One of the causes of complaint against the court was that trial by jury had been practically abolished by the associate judges. Undoubtedly the senator making this charge had in mind the course pursued by Judge Morsell and Judge Dunlop, Judge Cranch not sitting on account of illness, in the case of Mrs. Connor, claiming to be the widow of John P. Van Ness. After a hearing lasting five weeks, the court instructed the jury to bring in a verdict against the claimant,[4] which was done. William Easby, one of the jurors, refused to obey the instruction of the court. After the case was over, the jury gave out the statement that the vote stood five to seven in favor of sustaining the marriage.[5] An appeal was taken to the United States Supreme Court, which held that the finding of the jury was not a final judgment of the court upon which an appeal could be based, and that ended the case. The council for the plaintiff, Henry May and William J. Brent, were so indignant at the action of the court in taking the case away from the jury that they inserted a card in the *Intelligencer*, denouncing this action as unprecedented and an usurpation of the powers of the jury.[6] Three years later Mr. May expressed his opinion of a court decision in the presence of the court, and as a result was disbarred. It was not the practice of the court to charge the jury, but written instructions as prepared by counsel were given. This custom explains the arrangements of the old circuit-court room, which occupied the room on the east of the principal south entrance to the city hall. The judge was seated along the south wall, and in front of the bench was the jury-box, while in the centre of the railing that separated the bar from the public was the prisoner's box, so that both court and jury faced the counsel and the prisoner.[1] Some seven years after the Van Ness case had been disposed of, interest was again focussed on the court-room, when George A. Gardiner, who had been a dentist in Mexico, was arraigned, charged with fraud in obtaining a large award from the Mexican Claims Commission because of damages to a silver mine which he claimed to own in that country. On account of a pleasing address and manner, Dr. Gardiner had a large circle of friends and acquaintances who agreed with him that the proceedings were a persecution. At the first trial in 1851 the jury disagreed. The fraudulent nature of the entire claim was clearly brought out in the second trial, and when a verdict of guilty was announced, the accused man was seen to slip something in his mouth. When he reached the jail, he fell to the floor, and in a short time he was dead from strychnine poisoning.[2]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 20, 1848.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, May 13, 1850, p. 1000.

[3] *The Star*, Feb 17, 1858. The vote was 1646 for and 3872 against.

---

[1] Reminiscences of W. S. Cox, p. 500.

[2] Message of mayor. In Laws, 1851.

[3] *The Star*, March 3, 1888. List of homicides since 1850.

[4] *Intelligencer*, Dec. 30, 1846.

[5] The same, Jan. 1, 1847.

[6] The same, Jan. 2, 1847.

Five years later, not only the eyes of Washington, but of the entire country, were turned towards the criminal court, where Daniel E. Sickles, a member of congress from New York, was on trial for the killing of Philip Barton Key, the district attorney. Key had been shot down by Sickles on Madison Place, in front of what is now the site of Belasco's Theatre, on Sunday afternoon Feb. 27, 1859, following a confession by Mrs. Sickles of an intimacy with Mr. Key. After a trial which lasted from the 6th to the 26th of April, Mr. Sickles was acquitted, a result which the stenographic report of the trial states was received "amid the cheers of the audience."[3] At the table of the council for the defendant during this trial sat Edwin M. Stanton, afterward distinguished by his services as secretary of war.

---

[1] Reminiscences of W. S. Cox, p. 500. Also 21st Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 269, March 3, 1830, p. 9.

[2] *The Star*, March 3, 1854 Also see an article headed "A Celebrated Case," in the *Star*, Dec. 20, 1890.

[3] Trial of Hon. Daniel E. Sickles, New York [1859].

For three years he had been a resident of Washington, brought there by his practice before the United States Supreme Court.

At the time of the Washington tragedy, as it came to be called, James Buchanan had been two years in the White House. He was no longer the recognized head of the Democratic party, but only of that section of it which favored the extension of slave territory. At the beginning of his term the party was united. When the time came to make the arrangements for the inauguration, the efforts of the Jackson Democratic Association to assume the management were defeated. Instead, a public meeting was held, representing the entire party. The mayor of the city, Dr. William B. Magruder, presided. A chief marshal to arrange for the inaugural parade was elected, while a committee of twenty was appointed to plan for the ball.[1] A great building of wood, erected on Judiciary Square, was the scene of a largely attended ball,[2] when a united democracy greeted the new president. The rift in the party harmony became evident a few months later, when Stephen A. Douglas, in his place in the senate, denounced the pro-slavery constitution for Kansas, approved by the president and the southern leaders, but not submitted to the people of that territory. While the *Union* newspaper, that later took the name of the *Constitution,* was continued as the administration's organ, hardly a month after the inauguration a new Democratic paper, the *States*, appeared. Its proprietor, John P. Heiss, the business partner in the former firm of Ritchie and Heiss, the founders of the *Union*, avowed at the outset that he was a supporter of the administration, but reserved the right to express independent views. It was not long before the *States* became the organ of Stephen A. Douglas, who was not only the leader of the Democrats who did not adopt the extreme southern position, but who was also in the running for the presidential nomination of 1860.[1] For about a month after the publication of the *States* began, Washington again had five dailies. Then the *American Organ* died from inanition, a newspaper complaint that was so common in Washington under the current patronage system that it might be termed a periodic epidemic. The numbers thus reduced to four remained unchanged until the approach of the next presidential campaign.[2] In the last year of Buchanan's term the close connection between public printing and the newspaper press was finally broken. Then it happened that a southern senator, nettled that the *Union*, the national organ of his party, had taken sides with a faction in his own state which opposed him, called attention, in the course of a speech in the senate, to the existing public printing system. These disclosures led to an investigation,[3] with the result that congress decided to do its own printing, and authorized the establishment of the Government Printing-office, which was organized and set going by the Lincoln administration. This was not due to the war, with its far-reaching and transforming influence. For if war had not come, the radical change in the Washington newspaper press would have taken place. The change was not one of method as much as of control. The scandal of the growing printing profits, and their disposal, was becoming noisome. The government printing had increased in volume, reflecting the growth of the country. The same influence was at work changing the social usages of the day. For while the leisurely mode of life that was distinctive of the city and the social order, which was based on attainments and personal worth rather than on money, continued to a large extent unaltered during the two decades preceding the civil war, yet the increased number of people, as the city filled up, made necessary some modification in usages adapted for a more limited circle. To this cause may be attributed the omission of refreshments at formal White House receptions after Jackson's day.

---

[1] *Star*, Jan. 7, and *Intelligencer*, Jan. 9, 1857. William Selden, for eleven years prior to 1850 the treasurer of the United States, was elected marshal. For four years following, after leaving the government service, he was at the head of the banking firm of Selden, Withers and Co. (*Intelligencer*, Nov. 25, 1850, and Nov. 25, 1854.) He purchased a tract of land of seventy-six acres, comprising practically the site of what was later the subdivision of Mt. Pleasant, and built a large residence on Mt. Pleasant Street between Park Road and Newton Street, which was purchased in the opening years of the war by S. P. Brown for $10,000. (*The Star*, May 27, 1862.) A year after the inauguration President Buchanan appointed Mr. Selden marshal of the District, where he served until the Lincoln administration.

[2] *The Star*, Jan. 16 and March 4, 1857.

---

[1] *The Star*, July 13, 1860. Reminiscent article, by W. D. Wallach, on the newspapers of Washington since 1844. First issue of the *States*, April 17, 1857. Three months after the *Union* changed its name to the *Constitution* the discarded name was adopted by the *States*. Its title, beginning July 1, 1859, was *States and Union*. Last issue, library of congress file, April 20, 1861. Last issue of *Constitution*, Jan. 30, 1861.

[2] The morning dailies of the Buchanan period were the *Intelligencer* and *Union*. The evening dailies were the *Star* and the *States*. As the *Daily National Republican*, a morning paper, made its appearance Nov. 26, 1860, for the few months remaining of the administration five dailies were published. The *Globe* continued to have only the form of a newspaper.

[3] *Congressional Globe*, p. 471, Jan. 17, 1860. Also reports of the investigation. 30th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 205, June 12, 1860.

It is probable the serving of a bride's cake and champagne at a public afternoon reception seven years later, given by President Tyler for the bride he had just brought to the White House,[1] would have been omitted if it had been the season of the year when the town was full and congress was in session. Shortly before Van Buren left the White House, in 1841, the screen of pillars in the great entrance hall was filled in with glass, as a protection from the cold air that rushed in when the front door was opened.[2] Such a change suggests a constant flow, the coming and going of a crowded function. Already the social circle had outgrown the personal knowledge of a small community where every one knows every one else. At this period the practice was begun of designating by an asterisk in the Congressional Directory the names of members of the two houses who had their families with them.[3] The intimate association of the congressional messes, that brought together in the boarding-houses congenial spirits, began to change into the family life. For the most part the winter in Washington, for the average congressional family, was spent in hotels. A new era began for these establishments, as up to a few years prior to 1850 the boarding-house was given the preference.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, July 3, 1844.

[2] First Forty Years of Washington Society, p. 399. Souvenirs of My Times, Jesse Benton Fremont, p. 29. A return to the original arrangement was made in the general restoration of the house in 1902.

[3] Congressional Directory, 27th Cong., 2d Sess., 1841. Ten years later the information was extended so as to designate the married and single ladies.

This influence may be traced in the enlargement of hotel buildings and the erection of new structures.[1] A more marked change in living gradually began, when houses were leased by those who made their homes in Washington on account of official duties or because they wanted to enjoy the advantages of such a centre. Its progress may be traced, to some extent, in the list of members of congress and their places of abode, as given in the annual Congressional Directories. While but few members of the house had individual homes, this was not the case with those serving the longer term in the senate. By 1860, about forty per cent of the members of the upper house were occupying houses, while fifteen years earlier the percentage was little more than two per cent. For the most part, what may be termed the winter or seasonal residents of Washington, when they preferred their own establishments, rented instead of buying. An early exception was Stephen A. Douglas. In 1851, when he was about to enter upon his second term in the senate and was a presidential possibility, he bought two squares of ground on each side of I Street between New Jersey Avenue and 3d Street northwest.[1] On the one fronting on the south side of the street he built a house, where he made his home. Some four years later, after he had taken as his second wife Adele Cutts, the granddaughter of the sister of Mrs. Dolly Madison, and a reigning beauty, he built a house, 205 I Street, on the opposite side of the street, which on account of its size and furnishings was one of the notable residences of the time. On the adjoining lots to the east similar houses had just been built, the homes of Senator Henry M. Rice of Minnesota and John C. Breckinridge, the vice-president of the United States.[2] It was the largest enterprise of the sort ever undertaken in the city, and in a locality that was not only distant from the two principal residence sections, — the Court House and the White House localities, — but almost entirely unimproved. The general character of the section north of Massachusetts Avenue may be inferred from one of Gail Hamilton's letters written in 1858. In speaking of driving out in the country to the north, she said, that in leaving the residence of Dr. Gamaliel Bailey on C Street between John Marshall Place and 3d Street, where she spent two winters, "you just go across the commons and you are in the country."[3] The condition of the city at that period may also be pictured from an incident she relates of a walk about the city with Senator John P. Hale of New Hampshire. On their return, she says, a great pig ran against the senator and knocked him flat on his back on the pavement.

---

[1] In the year 1844 two four-story houses on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 3d Street and John Marshall Place were remodelled and became the United States Hotel. Gadsby Hotel, at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 3d Street, conducted by a son of the former proprietor of the hotel at Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th Street formerly bearing that name, was enlarged. St. Charles Hotel, at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 3d Streets, was built, while Gadsby Hotel, at Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th Street, was reopened by Samuel S. Coleman as the National Hotel, John Gadsby having given up the hotel business. He was living in the Decatur House, which he had purchased.

In 1847 the building of the Fountain Inn at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 12th Street was torn down and a four-story hotel building erected by A. Fuller and Co., known as Fuller's Hotel and later on as the Irving and also the Kirkwood House. The same year the City Hotel, at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, was leased by Edwin D. and Henry A. Willard, was remodelled and came to have the name of Willard Hotel. In 1851 the Indian Queen Hotel, Pennsylvania Avenue between 6th and 7th streets, was enlarged and its stucco front replaced by one of white marble.

When Senator Douglas first built, none of the streets adjoining the square where his house was located had been opened or improved or the grades established. The following year, when this work was done, it was discovered that a portion of the senator's house extended over the building line. So vague were his notions about the relations between the general government and the District that he addressed a memorial to the city council, asking that body to change the direction of the street, the property of the United States, so that it would run at right angles to New Jersey Avenue instead of 1st Street.[1] While the growing population and enlarged social circle wrought changes and modifications in the way of living and in social usages, the distinctive quality of simplicity was retained down to the war period. As the government offices closed at three o'clock, the dinner hour was four. That was the hour at the White House, but on days of company dinners the time was set forward an hour and a half.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 5, 1853.

[2] *The Star*, April 23, 1857. The three houses bore the name of Minnesota Row and are still standing.

[3] Gail Hamilton's Life in Letters, p. 170.

After dinner in the season came the promenade on Pennsylvania Avenue, ending at the capitol on Wednesdays and at the president's house on Saturdays, where the Marine Band played each week.[2] Following the afternoon stroll came invitations to tea at hospitable homes.

In addition to the drawing-rooms every other week at the White House, the president and his family were at home two evenings in the week, informally, to those who chose to call. Mr. Van Buren, when he left the White House in 1841, did not leave behind the gilt dessert service he had acquired while in diplomatic service abroad. He also took with him the gold spoons which inspired a partisan speech in the house during the presidential campaign of 1840. These were personal belongings, but that was not the case with the mirror plateau that evidently made its appearance at the White House dinners about this time. The rather ceremonious mode of living of the Van Buren régime gave way to the less formal ideas of President Tyler, who lived as he had been accustomed to live on his plantation on the James River. When callers came, he felt free to invite them to go to the dining-room, where the sideboard was well supplied.[1] The delicate health of Mrs. Tyler prevented her from seeing many people. Before the close of the first two years her death occurred. Mrs. Robert Tyler, the wife of the eldest son of the president, and also his youngest daughter were the ladies of the White House until some eight months before the close of the administration. Then the president, who was fifty-six years old, went over to New York and returned with his bride,[2] a Miss Julia Gardiner of Long Island, who was twenty years of age. She had spent a couple of winters in Washington. Four months previous to the wedding the bride's father joined a party of officials to witness the trial of a new gun on board the man-of-war *Princeton*, that had come up the Potomac. While President Tyler and others were in the cabin, the gun was fired for the third time and burst, killing several persons, among whom was Miss Gardiner's father.[3] This tragic occurrence brought the affair of the heart to a crisis. The bride of the White House enjoyed her brief term. When she went out, four horses drew her carriage, and at the receptions she received the guests seated in a large arm-chair, on a slightly raised platform in the blue room.[4] Adopting the practice followed at the receptions at Windsor Castle, the names of her guests were announced upon entering the room.[5] In the closing days of the administration, when President Tyler signed the bill providing for the admission of Texas, he gave the pen he used to his wife, who proudly wore "the immortal gold pen" suspended from her neck.[6] On March 1, the same day the Texas bill was signed, the president elect and Mrs. Polk were entertained at dinner at the White House.[7]

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, May 5, 1853.

[2] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 3, p. 307. Gail Hamilton's Life in Letters, p. 186.

---

[1] Perley's Reminiscences, Vol. 1, p. 303.

[2] *Intelligencer*, July 3, 1844

[3] The same, Feb. 29, 1844.

[4] Souvenirs of My Time, Jesse Benton Fremont, p. 99.

[5] Recollections of Men and Things at Washington, p. 67, L. A. Gobright.

[6] Letters and Times of the Tylers, Vol. 2, p. 369. Mrs. Tyler to Mrs. Gardiner, March 6, 1845.

[7] The president elect arrived in the city, Feb. 13, 1845. He was received at the depot by the Democratic association of the District and escorted to the National or Coleman's Hotel, and on Monday

The president on inauguration day rode with his successor to the capitol through the rain that fell steadily during the day, and then returned to the hotel. The next day he and his wife left for their home in Virginia.[1] As the only Whig of the Harrison cabinet retaining his portfolio in the administration of Tyler, Daniel Webster, the secretary of state, was bitterly denounced. But personal inclinations and interests were subordinated to what he considered his duty to the public in carrying to completion the negotiations which resulted in the settlement of the vexed northeastern boundary dispute with England. Soon after the opening of the second year of the administration, Lord Ashburton, as a representative of England, came to this country on this mission.

He leased the residence 1525 H Street. Webster, upon entering upon his duties as secretary of state, purchased the Swan house, 1611 H Street, and for the first time during his public life in Washington as member of the house and of the senate, stretching over nearly two decades, he had his own home in the city. The location of the two houses brought the two negotiators in convenient proximity, both in a business and social way. In financial matters Webster did not possess the qualities that gave him success as a statesman, so that when he left the state department, in the course of a couple of years, he was unable to keep the house. However, upon returning to the senate in 1845, he did not go back to the practice of his earlier days in Washington and live in rented rooms. Instead he purchased a house on D Street, between 5th and 6th streets northwest, now a portion of the site occupied by the police court building, where he lived during the rest of his public life.

The H Street house was purchased by W. W. Corcoran, the

---

following, the day before the inauguration, the Tylers left the White House and went to the City or Fuller's Hotel at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street. It was then conducted by Azariah Fuller, who had resumed the management after the building had been occupied by the post-office department from 1836 to 1842.

[1] Letters and Times of the Tylers, Vol. 2, p. 369.

Washington banker, who improved and enlarged it, and made the extensive grounds attractive with flowers and shrubbery. In one of the extensions he provided a gallery for paintings, which became the nucleus of the Corcoran Art Gallery, that through his liberality was housed in an attractive building erected at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 17th Street. While the building was up when the war came, it was used by the government and was not completed and opened as a gallery of art until 1871.

In 1849 Mr. Corcoran's collection of paintings and that of J. C. McGuire, in a gallery attached to his house 612 E Street northwest, were the only ones in the city.[1] The occupancy of the Clarke house by Lord Ashburton was followed by that of Sir Henry Bulwer, the minister from England, on whose staff was his nephew, Edward Bulwer, then nineteen years of age, who some ten years later achieved fame by his poem "Lucile," published under the pen name of Owen Meredith. The Clarke house was subsequently purchased by Colonel William G. Coleman, of the army, and remodelled into much the form it has to-day.

---

[1] *The Star*, May 25, 1878.

CHAPTER XVI

EFFECT OF THE JOHN BROWN RAID

THE helplessness of the capital city in the face of threatened disturbance was brought out during the period of alarm and apprehension caused by the John Brown raid on Harper's Ferry in the fall of 1859, just as it had been, only in a less degree, two years before, when election roughs for a time held control in the city. As the story of what John Brown had done gained in volume and fantastic proportions the farther it travelled from the scene, so it came about that in Washington, the October morning following the daring, reckless seizure of the government armory, sixty-four miles to the northwest, it was feared that not only the city was to be attacked, but that a servile insurrection with all its horrors would follow.

Even after it was known that the armed force that had dared to invade a state and seize United States property numbered only nineteen, and all had been killed or captured, with the exception of two, still until the entire truth was known, and Brown himself was dead, fears were felt of a general uprising of the colored people. As the only United States force near at hand, 106 marines, under the command of Robert E. Lee, subsequently the southern chieftain, were sent from the Washington barracks, arms were procured by the mayor of the city from the war department and placed at police headquarters, while special men were mounted and stationed at every highway leading into the city. Precautions were adopted to guard against an outbreak of the colored people. All permits for entertainments and meetings for this class were withdrawn, while the public continued a prey to disturbing rumors.[1] There was no militia in the District subject to the call of the president, and so his only resource was to appeal to the mayor of the city. At the request of the latter, four volunteer companies assembled at their armories in readiness in case of need.[1] In the course of some six weeks after this attempt, either foolhardy or idealistic, according to the point of view, John Brown paid the death penalty for treason and conspiracy to murder. His aim had been to do away with slavery. The immediate general effect was only to deepen the lines that had been forming for years, dividing the country into two sections. But to the federal authorities, as well as to the citizens of the Nation's capital, the Harper's Ferry happening served to emphasize anew the need of a militia in the District. After the Northern Liberties Market riot in 1857, an effort was made to revive the militia on some practical basis, yet beyond the appointment, by John B. Floyd, of Virginia, the secretary of war, of a commission of regular army officers and officers of the old militia and volunteer companies of the District to prepare a plan of reorganization, nothing was done.[2] After the John Brown raid, congress was informed that the inadequacy of the regular army, especially in view of the extent of the frontier country, was a sufficient reason for placing the District militia in a state of efficiency, as a detachment from the army could not be spared for the Nation's capital.[3] How this was to be done was pointed out in a report prepared by the same commission, and which was now sent to congress, with recommendations that changes be made in the militia law that had been unaltered since 1803.

---

[1] *The Star*, Oct. 18, 1859.

The prospect of a revival of the militia system met with public approval. Interest was renewed in the volunteer companies. New companies were organized.[4] The ranks of the

---

[1] *The Star*, Oct. 18, 1859. The companies that responded were the National Guards, Union Guards, Yagers and Light Infantry, a force of probably about 150 men.

[2] 36th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 89, May, 31, 1860.

[3] The same.

[4] These were National Rifles, 60 men; captain, F. B. Schæffer. (*Star*, Dec. 8, 1859.) National Blues, 40 men; captain, John Watts. (The same, Jan. 12, 1860.)

Washington Light Infantry were recruited, so that, for the first time, it had a battalion formation of two companies.[1] A few months later, when the first embassy from Japan to this country reached the city, the condition of the volunteer militia companies showed such an improvement that no less than seven, two of them recently organized, turned out for escort duty. In addition, Georgetown's only military company, the Potomac Light Infantry, as well as the cadets of Georgetown College, were in line.[2] But while the recommendations of the militia board as to changes in the law were sent to congress, they were not taken up in either house. In the meanwhile, President Buchanan, by special order, approved the plan for reorganizing the militia under existing laws. He also issued a commission to Roger C. Weightman as major-general in command.[3] Then nothing more was done, so that a year after the Harper's Ferry affair, except the formation of two additional volunteer companies, and recruiting the numbers of one or two others, the military provision for the protection of the city remained unchanged. In that interval, however, the presidential campaign of 1860 had been held. Lincoln had been elected, and the secession movement was under way.

What was to be the fate of Washington if the government was to be broken up? If the city was to be no longer the seat of government, what would become of it? For, unlike other communities, its growth and prosperity were due, not to commerce and trade, but solely because it was the national centre. It is true, it was reasoned, a division of the country would not necessarily mean that Washington would cease to be a capital city. For if Maryland and Virginia went with the south, then Washington would become the seat of the southern republic.[4] No doubt, purely material and selfish considerations had a place in the current thought of District citizens on the great issue, just as in the country at large the interests of trade and business between the two sections had a wide influence. Yet all were submerged in the rising tide of patriotism when the Nation's existence was threatened. But before an overt step was taken, before union or disunion became the clearly defined issue, a union sentiment predominated in Washington, from which was not lacking, it may be concluded, the impulse of devotion to country. Two days after the election of Lincoln, the *Star*, that had advocated the election of Breckinridge, the southern candidate, and had the largest circulation in the District of any local newspaper, declared that "the doctrine of secession on the part of the south because of the election of Lincoln is obnoxious to the democracy of this section of the country." [1] On the same day, the Washington correspondent of the *New York Herald* sent a despatch to his paper, in which he said the business men and property holders were in favor of acquiescing in the will of the majority.[2] However, entire unanimity did not prevail any more than in other sections of the country during this period. For while the union sentiment was dominant, yet there were to be heard also all the varying shades of opinion. Some residents were so ardent in their feeling for the southern cause that they donned the blue cockade and proclaimed their willingness to take up arms to prevent the inauguration of Lincoln.[3] A similar situation existed in Maryland, where the District was located, and where there was a strong southern feeling. Yet the controlling public opinion there was on the side of the union. Washington, while a slaveholding community in a slave territory, was not a southern town. Nor was it a northern town, but something of both.[4] Neither did it take its political hue from the national administration, as self-interest would seem to dictate, so that frequently the politics of the city and of the administration were not the same. A presidential campaign was as actively contested as if votes were to be gained. No doubt, members of the administration and of congress made use of these political gatherings to gain a wider hearing, but even so, they had a local audience to listen to them, and a local organization under whose auspices they spoke. The campaign of 1860 illustrates the variety of political expression. Clubs or associations in the interests of each of the four presidential candidates were organized. Ratification meetings of the four parties were held. An indication of the political sympathies of the mayor at that period is to be found in his presiding over the meeting that ratified the nomination of Breckinridge. With the exception of Lincoln, all the candidates had newspaper organs.[1] The Jackson Democratic Association, the old local political organization, was so equally divided between the Douglas and Breckinridge factions that, in order to avoid strife, it adjourned at the beginning of the campaign until after the election.[2] The campaign device of the Republicans, the wide-awake organization with its capes and torches, was adopted in Washington with enthusiasm. Headquarters were established at the Republican Wigwam at the northwest corner of Indiana Avenue and 2d Street, formerly the printing-office of the *National Era*, and at that time the meeting-place of the Republican association. Towards the close of the campaign the Democrats, especially those of southern sympathies, started, in various parts of the country, the National Volunteers, a military organization designed to stand for the rights of the south.[3] One was formed in Washington. In about two months it had a membership of 250, but was without arms, while two days after the election the membership of the Republican association had risen to 1600.[1] Several months before the election of Lincoln the Republican organization and its activities attracted the attention of members of that party in the house, where, for the first time, the Republicans outnumbered the Democrats, although they did not have a control. Resenting an attempt to break up a meeting called to indorse the nomination of Lincoln, the appropriation for the capitol extension and for the auxiliary guard, important District items, were stricken out of the appropriation bill. While the bill, with these appropriations restored, subsequently became a law, yet before that result was reached the *Star*, moralizing on the extreme partisanship displayed at times in the District, spoke of the bad policy of "mixing up politics with municipal affairs, as the District was dependent on both parties and ought not to place itself in opposition to either." [2] But when the returns in November showed the election of Lincoln, forgetting the rebuke which the Republican influence in the house administered early in the campaign, partisan violence again broke out, this time in a mob attack on the Republican headquarters. Owing to the lateness of the hour, the jubilant Republicans had gone home and the place was deserted. After partially wrecking the building, the mob was dispersed by the police.[3] At that time the Democrats were the dominant party in local politics, but, as the municipal election the preceding June showed, their power was waning. Although they placed two tickets in the field, one headed by the mayor, James E. Berret, and the other by W. B. Magruder, a former mayor, the latter secured only 147 votes out of a total of nearly 7000, the largest vote ever cast in a city election. The independent ticket, headed by Richard Wallach, who had received from the Whig administration in 1849 the appointment of marshal of the District, came within twenty votes of the number received by

---

[1] *The Star*, March 1, 1860. By the fall the Infantry had three and the National Guard two companies. The same, Sept. 12, 1860.

[2] The same, May 14, 1860.

[3] The same, March 22, 1860.

[4] *New York Herald*, Nov. 21, 1860.

---

[1] Nov. 8, 1860. *The Star*, March 26 and 28, 1867.

[2] Nov. 9, 1860.

[3] The same.

[4] No doubt Lincoln, in his response to a serenade a few days after his arrival in the city, expressed the current notion that Washington was a southern town in sentiment as well as in location when he assured citizens that much of the ill feeling they had towards the people from amongst whom he came was due to a misunderstanding. *The Star*, March 1, 1861.

---

[1] The *Intelligencer* advocated the election of Bell, the Constitutional Union party candidate, while the *States and Union* continued to be a Douglas paper. The administration organ, the *Constitution*, supported Breckinridge, as did the *Star*. At the request of the Bell party committee, a weekly campaign paper, the *Union Guard*, was published by N. D. Larner and Co.

[2] *The Star*, June 26, Aug. 1 and 31, 1860.

[3] The same, Nov. 2, 1860.

---

[1] *New York Herald*, Nov. 9, 1860. The correspondent adds that "each and every one expects an office." Also 36th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 79, p. 105, Feb. 14, 1861.

[2] May 25, 1860.

[3] *The Star*, *The States and Union*, Nov. 7, 1860.

Berret.[1] The election was marked by disorder. Fraud was charged by Wallach.[2] While no doubt the great issue of the day had an influence in the contest, yet, after all, the closeness of the vote was due largely to dissatisfaction with the local administration, especially of the police.[3] After the election, the *Star*, favoring a cleaner police service, advocated the plan which had been adopted for the same reason in New York city, several years before, and had just gone into operation in Baltimore, taking from the city government all control of the police force, and vesting it in a state commission. Such a body, if provided in Washington, was to be appointed by the secretary of the interior, instead of being elected by the legislatures, as in the case of the states.[4] "Property Holder," the author of a newspaper communication, went further, and favored placing the entire management of the city in the hands of congress. Then, he declared, "the property holders will be relieved from the everlasting political excitement during the election campaign, in which they are scarcely permitted to participate, and which eventually they will be entirely deprived of, if the present system is suffered to remain. Then taxes will be reduced, life and property made secure and our city saved from further disgrace by insult to national parties, composed of members of congress and others, at their meetings in the District."[5] Beyond these expressions the discussion ended, no doubt lost sight of in the absorption of the national political campaign, the most momentous in the country's history. While the notion of federalizing the entire city government was something new, that of giving the control of the police force to a federal commission was not. But its advocacy at this time cannot be entirely accounted for by the disappointment and chagrin of the defeated party in the local election,[1] and resentment over the fraud and intimidation which were freely charged against the successful party. For, three years before, the attention of congress had been called to what was undoubtedly a prolific source, not only of dissatisfaction with the management of city affairs, but of actual inefficiency in its government, and that was the working of the local political machine, built up largely from the patronage that the appointments to both the city and federal police force gave to the mayor. During the closing months of Dr. Magruder's mayoralty, in 1857–1858, the secretary of the interior, Jacob Thompson, who had general supervision of federal interests in the District, recommended to congress, that the appointment of members of the auxiliary guard be vested in the secretary of the interior instead of in the mayor.[2] The subject was not again revived until after the warmly contested mayoralty election, in June, 1860, and Mayor Berret had begun his second term. Some months after the comments referred to had been uttered, and when congress met, police legislation was asked for, but much broader in its scope than what had been proposed. Then, instead of dealing only with the auxiliary guard, a section of the city police or even with the city police as a whole, a force for the entire District was proposed to be appointed and governed by a federal-appointed commission.[3] The feature of federal-appointed local officials was suggestive of the early practice when the mayor of the city was a presidential appointee. But the proposition to treat the District as a whole, by providing one police force, while reminiscent of the early discussions, when a government for the entire District was advocated, also expressed a feeling current at the time, and destined to grow stronger, that there were too many governments in the District. For it was at that period that the merger of the municipalities of Georgetown and Washington was proposed. As outlined by Georgetown, that town was to become two wards of Washington.[1] A joint committee of the Washington city council recommended that the question be submitted to the people at the next election.[2] By that time, however, the war had opened, which amply accounts for its being dropped.

---

[1] *Intelligencer*, June 4, 6 and 12; *The Star*, June 5, 1860.

[2] *The Star*, June 2 and 6, 1860.

[3] The same, June 2, 1860.

[4] The same, June 6, 1860. Municipal Administration, John A. Fairlie, p. 89. Financial History of Baltimore, J. H. Hollander, p. 223.

[5] *The Star*, June 18, 1860.

---

[1] The editor of the *Star* was a brother of Richard Wallach, the defeated candidate.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, July 15, 1861, p. 133.

[3] The same, p. 191, Dec. 24, 1860.

The plan to reduce the functions of the city government by taking away from it all control of the police met with no protest until it was proposed to place the cost upon the citizens. Then a joint resolution was adopted by the city council, instructing its congressional committee to oppose that feature.[3] The bill did not become a law in any form. A few months later, when the congress that resulted from the centrifugal campaign of 1860, with a Republican majority in both houses, was called in special session by President Lincoln, because of the emergency of war, a federal police was provided for the District.[4]

No doubt with the city filled, as it had been for some weeks, with raw recruits, under very imperfect discipline, congress had daily an object-lesson of the need of a large and efficient police. It was not, however, purely a war measure. Its antecedents, its provisions and the discussions upon it show that. As the outcome of the reform movement, which was a factor in the Berret-Wallach contest of 1860, no doubt it met the approval of many citizens. As insuring the control of the city police being in the hands of appointees by the newly elected president, it was a source of satisfaction to members of the dominant party, to whom partisan advantage was more readily appreciated than the merits of local affairs, about which they had but slight knowledge.

For the first three years the police commission was not such an anomaly in city government as it was in other towns, because it disbursed federal funds except in providing the station-

[1] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 28 and Dec. 4, 1860.

[2] *The Star*, Dec. 4, 1860.

[3] Joint Resolution, Feb. 15, 1862. *The Star*, Feb. 8, 1861.

[4] The bill providing a Metropolitan police force, which became a law Aug. 6, 1861, placed the appointment and control of members of the force in a commission of five appointed by the president and confirmed by the senate.

houses and lighting and heating, which was done at city expense. Elsewhere, the towns supplied all the money which the state commission spent. This contrast was made less marked in three years, for then congress required the District to pay one-third of the cost.[1] But before that time the powers of the Metropolitan Police Board were enlarged, so that it erected station-houses which the city government was obliged to pay for, and also established a sanitary inspection service, which did away with the board of health maintained by the city.[2] If it had been necessary, owing to the opposition of citizens, to defend this assumption of power, then no doubt it would have been urged, in addition to charges of politics in police administration, that the loyalty of the citizens was doubtful. For that was the voice of rumor, not only during the months of intense suspicion and distrust, preceding the opening of the war, but it continued to affect the relations of congress and the District during the entire war.

In Washington as elsewhere, especially during the period of uncertainty before and after the inauguration of Lincoln, as to how people stood on the question of preserving the Union, suspicion supplied the place of information. The community was torn with conflicting emotions and interests. "Men went mad with fear or rage. Old sores broke out, and cords of amity that seemed eternal were burst. Men were here disloyal, and then suddenly and violently loyal."[3] At the president's reception on New Year's day, both union and secession cockades were seen. Some of the women, not content with this outward symbol of their opinions, swept by President Buchanan "with an effort at display of lofty disdain" and at the same time ignoring his proffered hand.[4] The response in Washington to the secession of South Carolina was the display of the national flag from business houses and residences.[5]

---

[1] Stats., 13, 159, June 25, 1864.

[2] Stats., 12, 378, July 16, 1862. *The Star*, Aug. 8, 1863. It was not until the fall of 1865 that the board of health began to resume any of its functions. Journal, 63d Council, p. 304.

[3] Reminiscences of Epiphany, Rev. C. H. Hall, p. 21, 1873.

[4] *New York Herald*, Jan. 1, 1861.

[5] *The Star*, Dec. 22, 1860.

The importance of the attitude of the community was overshadowed at times by apprehension as to the future of the city. Disquieting rumors were current that an armed force was being assembled in Maryland and Virginia to take possession of the capitol and prevent the inauguration of Lincoln.[1] The *Richmond Enquirer* added to the uneasiness by advocating that Washington be occupied as the confederate capital.[2] With the Union dissolved, it was asserted the Nation's capital would become an abiding-place for bats and owls.[3] The material interests of the city were affected by the secession movement. Hardly a week after the election of Lincoln it was found there was no market for real estate.[4] The following week the Richmond Bank suspended, unable to meet the drain upon its specie, due to demands from northern creditors, disturbed by the threatening outlook. In consequence, the Washington banks suspended to protect their specie resources.[5]

After the secession of South Carolina in December, 1860, and the places of southern sympathizers in the cabinet had been filled with Union men, the policy of inaction on the part of the Buchanan administration changed. Disunion was to be resisted, and more especially the capital city was to be secured from capture.

General Winfield Scott, in command of the army, was directed to take steps for the protection of the capital. At that time it was commonly believed that the city was filled with southern sympathizers, and the government service was tainted with disloyalty. Finally the current rumors, that an organization hostile to the government existed in the city, were so numerous and positive, that the latter part of January the house appointed a committee to investigate. After a long hearing, the committee was unable to find any evidence of the existence of such an organization. The testimony taken, however, is interesting as showing, four or five weeks before Lincoln was inaugurated, some contemporary notions about the loyalty to the union of the citizens of Washington.[1] General Winfield Scott told the committee that a great many people speak of the District as of doubtful loyalty. Cornelius Boyle, the senior officer or captain of the National Volunteers, believed that a large majority of the people were southern in their feeling. Although, as he added, it might be because he came in contact only with that class of people. In the opinion of Captain John H. Goddard, who, for nearly twenty years, had been at the head of the city police, a large majority of the people of the District were in favor of the preservation of the union. A little more than two weeks after the election of Lincoln the *Daily National Republican* appeared, the first newspaper printed in Washington as the organ of the Republican party.[2] It took its place in a field where there were already four daily papers, and all but one, the *Constitution*, were for the union.[3] That paper continued to advocate secession doctrines, and also to enjoy the patronage of the advertising of the executive departments, until the southern men left the cabinet, and then, as its support was withdrawn, the publication ceased.[4] A further suggestion of the strength of union sentiment was the appearance, a few weeks after the inauguration, of the *Sunday Chronicle*. As the first Sunday newspaper published in Washington at a period when "every other leading city"[5] had one, no doubt it attracted attention. But the real significance lay in the principles it advocated. For at that time, the *States and Union*, the former Douglas organ, had adopted the opposite course, and had "raised the disunion standard as a last hope of getting money out of somebody."[6] But it failed and ceased to appear. It thus came about that, in the course of a month after the *Chronicle* appeared, the newspaper situation had changed. But three dailies, the *Intelligencer,* the *Star* and the *Republican,* were left. Then, too, the owner of the *Chronicle,* John W. Forney, was at that time the secretary of the senate. While the advertising of the departments was secured,[1] Lincoln did not adopt it as his organ, and, in fact, he had no newspaper organ. However, it was a year and a half, nearly, before the venture of a daily issue was attempted. Then there were four dailies getting their living from the community, a result only made possible by the abnormal increase in the population.

---

[1] *New York Herald*, Dec. 17, 1860, and Jan. 1, 1861.

[2] *The Star*, Jan. 1, 2 and 3, 1861.

[3] *New York Herald*, Dec. 29, 1860.

[4] The same, Nov. 13, 1860.

[5] *The Star*, Nov. 22, 1860.

---

[1] 36th Cong., 2d Sess., House Rep. No. 79, Feb. 14, 1861.

[2] *The Star*, Nov. 24, 1860. The publishers were Lewis Clephane and Co., formerly the printers of the *National Era* that ended its career in the spring, owing to lack of support.

[3] The same, Jan. 1, 1861.

[4] *The Constitution*, Jan. 30, 1861. The editor, Wm. M. Browne, became assistant secretary of state of the confederate government. *The Star*, March 13, 1861.

[5] *Sunday Morning Chronicle*, March 31, 1861.

[6] *The Star*, April 24, 1861.

Less than a year after the *Daily Chronicle* appeared, the Democrats again had a newspaper. This was the *Daily Constitutional Union,* an afternoon paper that appeared on June 9, 1863. It was edited by Thomas B. Florence, a former member of the house from Pennsylvania. While it passed through the vicissitudes which change of name and of management frequently means, yet it lived for nearly six years.[2] More than a year passed before the Democratic party again had a mouthpiece at the Nation's capitol, and then the *Daily Patriot* appeared, which lived for about two years, or until the fall of 1872. During the rest of the decade ending in 1870, besides the five dailies, one Republican daily appeared for a short time, as was the case with three other dailies.[3] The change in policy that marked the opening of the year 1861, the determination of the administration to protect public property, whether at the capitol or in South Carolina, was modified by a public opinion, sensitive about anything that looked like the coercion of states. Apprehension was felt that a display of armed force by the government would have an unfortunate influence in the border states then hesitating in the balance between the north and the south. This condition made it necessary for General Scott to proceed with caution in bringing soldiers of the regular army to Washington. He welcomed the suggestion to make use of the District militia, especially as Colonel Charles P. Stone, in making it, assured him, apparently to his surprise, that "two-thirds of the fighting stock of the population would sustain the government in defending itself if called upon." [1] Colonel Stone, who was formerly an officer in the army, and had served with General Scott in Mexico, was in a position to know about current local opinion, for he had been in Washington since the previous summer, engaged in completing a report on government surveys. In the course of this work he had occasion to consult the historical library of Peter Force, and had been thrown into his society. Although past his seventieth year, Mr. Force still retained an interest in local military affairs, in which, for many years, he had been active.

---

[1] Poore, Vol. 2, p. 127.

[2] *Baltimore Sun,* Feb. 4, 1869.

[3] The papers were the *Evening Leader*, radical Republican, Feb. 14 to April 10, 1867; the *Daily Times*, independent, March 15, 1864–July 21, 1866; the *Evening Express*, Democratic, Jan. 10, 1867–Sept. 18, 1869, and then appearing for a short time as the *National Intelligencer and Express;* the *Morning News*, independent, Sept. 18, 1869–Feb. 15, 1870.

As the result of this knowledge of the situation, Colonel Stone advised that the militia be organized. Appointed on the staff of General Scott, with the rank of colonel, and designated for duty as inspector-general of the District militia, he undertook the work. He had the hearty coöperation of a large number of the local military men, of whom, it was said, that "with a single exception every military company in Washington [referring to the volunteer companies] has in some form or other exhibited its love for the union and its readiness to sustain law and order in this city. All praise to the patriotic soldiery of Washington." [2] Then President Buchanan completed and made public the list of militia appointments which he had undertaken to prepare some months before.[3] The plan adopted provided for eight regiments, each of ten companies.[4] Before the end of six weeks, fifteen companies, aggregating about one thousand men, were in uniform at the expense of the citizens, the government furnishing the guns.[1] Not only was the number of military companies in the District more than doubled, but about three times the number of men were enrolled. By means of the District militia the force available for the government (for under the militia law these local organizations were subject to a call into the general service) was nearly doubled.[2] All doubt as to whether the city had an available force, as well as whether the citizens had "enough spunk" to form one, was dissipated.[3] In contrast with the early scepticism of General Scott, as to the dependence to be placed on the people, was his announcement, after such a demonstration, that the reliance of the government for the protection of the city was on the District militia and some detachments of regular troops.[4] The state of mind in regard to the safety of the city at the opening of the year 1861 may be judged somewhat by the measures adopted for its protection. While the regular troops ordered to the city were on their way, and before the enrolment of the militia had begun, a company of marines from the barracks in the city, the only available federal force, was sent to Fort Washington on the Potomac, twelve miles south of the city. It was the first defensive measure of the civil war to be carried out by the federal government. At that time the place was of no consequence as a means of defence, as for several years the guns had been dismantled and it had been without a garrison.[5] But it might be occupied by a hostile force. The next day, stirred by threats of invasion, a mass-meeting of citizens was held. As a result, a military company was formed in each ward to constitute a union regiment.[6] The companies that were then formed became a part of the District militia. During these weeks in January the secession plans in the south were rapidly maturing, and as the cotton states, one after the other, voted in favor of secession, their representatives in congress said their farewells, while a number of officers of the army and navy, and of those holding civil appointments, sent in their resignations.[1] No doubt an influence in hastening action in the case of many, especially those in the departmental service, was the union sentiment in Washington. For, it was declared, a movement was on foot to remove all the officeholders who have not declared themselves for the union.[2] How general the exodus of southern sympathizers from the government service which started at this time was, may be judged, as a few months later only a scattering few resigned rather than to take, as required by the law enacted by the first Republican congress, an oath of allegiance so worded as to meet the union view of the great issue of the day.[3] It was a time of separation as well as of decision. By the middle of January, it was noted at the president's reception that "with few exceptions, the party that elected Buchanan to office was absent. The party that opposed him was represented by its best men in Washington." [4] From both the standpoint of the government and of the citizens the organization of the militia was a union measure. The test of loyalty was applied, and in the enrolment of fifteen companies disaffection in only two companies was brought to light.[5] This result was reached, not by the usual method of

---

[1] Washington on the Eve of War. Charles P. Stone, *Century*, July, 1883, p. 458.

[2] *The Star*, Jan. 1, 1861.

[3] The same, Jan. 15, 1861. Complete list in the issue of the 28th inst.

[4] The same, Jan. 26, 1861.

---

[1] This estimate is based on the militia parade on Washington's birthday (*The Star*, Feb. 22 and 23, 1861), when the militia made its first public appearance, and also on the list of companies in the inaugural parade.

[2] 36th Cong., 2d Sess., House Rep. No. 79, p. 60. General Scott's testimony.

[3] *The Star*, Feb. 23, 1861.

[4] The same, Feb. 11, 1861.

[5] The same, Jan. 8, 1861.

[6] The same, Jan. 8, 1861. The plan adopted was proposed by Edward C. Carrington, a native of Virginia, who had served in the

---

legislature of that state and was then a member of the District bar. He had seen service in the Mexican war, and had commanded the Washington Light Infantry and had been for some months a brigadier-general of the militia appointed by President Buchanan. (*Intelligencer*, Nov. 3, 1861.) He was district attorney from April 17, 1861 to April 21, 1870.

[1] *New York Herald*, Jan. 24, 1861.

[2] The same, Jan. 14, 1861.

[3] Stats., 12, 326, Aug. 6, 1861. See notices in *National Republican* after this date of resignations of department employés.

[4] *New York Herald*, Jan. 16, 1861.

[5] These were the National Rifles, Captain F. B. Schaeffer, and a company formed by members of the National Volunteers. *New York Herald*, Jan. 30; *The Star*, Feb. 12, 1861. Also Colonel Stone's narrative, *Century*, July 1883, p. 460.

requiring an oath, as the current form to support the constitution was meaningless, but by careful supervision on the part of militia officers, representatives both of the government and of the citizens. Colonel Stone sat with General Weightman at the headquarters of the District militia, in the library room of the patent office, where the company lists for enrolment were received.[1] In addition, Colonel Stone made use of government detectives, who became members of companies that there was any reason to suspect were not friendly to the government. As subsequent events indicate, the enrolment would have been practically unaltered had the Democratic senate agreed with the house in requiring of every man entering the militia the regular army oath, pledging allegiance to the United States government.[2] The only opposition met with was of trivial consequence. It came from the mayor of the city, who refused the request of General Weightman for the names and addresses of the city police, so that, as the general explained, in the event their assistance was needed, they could be summoned promptly. Apparently the mayor's sense of official importance was offended, as he informed the militia commander that, as chief magistrate, he was the one to determine when circumstances demanded the use of the police.[3] But some no doubt attributed his course to a deeper motive, and this incident served to confirm what proved to be a groundless suspicion of his loyalty which was current at that time.[4] But while the mayor was defending "the great principle," as he termed it, of the subordination of the military to the civil power, armed forces were being brought to the city, and it was even then taking on somewhat the appearance of a camp. For a week after the mayor sent his labored exposition to the militia commander, the plans of General Scott for the concentration of regular troops in the city were completed. As the barracks at the arsenal and the militia armory on the Mall were the only places in the city designed for the use of troops, ground was leased by the government, and barracks as well as buildings for the stabling of the cavalry horses were erected, north of the capitol, and also west of 17th Street, near the White House.[1] A week before the 13th of February, when the electoral count was held and when, according to current rumor, force would be used to prevent the official declaration of the result of the presidential election, the eight companies of regulars, comprising 640 men that General Scott ordered to the city, were located so as to be easily available. Some were quartered near the capitol, and some in a hired house in the vicinity of the president's house. One company occupied the extension of the treasury building, which was not quite completed.[2] Then there were troops at the arsenal and at the District armory, besides 200 marines at the Marine Barracks.[3] While carpenters, employed by the government, were erecting army barracks in the city, it was decided by citizens to build a frame structure adjoining the city hall on the north for the inaugural ball.[4] Three weeks later the contract was let for the largest structure ever provided on a similar occasion.[5] Although there seemed to be no doubt in the minds of the citizens planning for this affair that Lincoln would be inaugurated and a ball would follow, the members of the Republican association sought the assurance of General Scott before it was decided whether, "owing to the peculiar circumstances and condition of the country," [6] an attempt should be made to have a parade. When that was given, the president of the association, B. B. French, was elected chief marshal. Early in the morning of the following day, Feb. 23, the president elect arrived in the city, having made the journey from Philadelphia secretly, as he was advised of danger in passing through Baltimore if his coming was known. While the members of the Republican association were encouraged to arrange for an inaugural parade, and were told that the commanding general of the army would be ready with the military force at his command, in case of need, they were also told by General Scott that he would have nothing to do with the arrangements. But in point of fact, he was so fearful that some hostile demonstration would be made, that he took entire charge.[1] This feeling was not confined to General Scott, or to the members of the Republican association, for not a single political club or military organization from abroad, or from the city, took part in the parade, as had become the custom. In place of a civilian's demonstration, it was like a military expedition, liable to be attacked at any moment. About the carriage containing the president and the president elect, the ranks of soldiers were massed so closely that it was difficult to get a glimpse of the occupants.[2] Armed soldiers, stationed on the housetops on each side of Pennsylvania Avenue, watched the thronged sidewalks and windows, while a cordon of soldiers was drawn about the platform, on the east front of the capitol. The windows of that structure commanding a view of the scene bristled with guns. As the procession passed the intersection of a street, a cavalry detachment stationed there fell in line, while General Scott, with a guard, took a position near the capitol, on the north side.

---

[1] *The Star*, Feb. 12 and 14, 1861.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, p. 605, Jan. 28, 1861; p. 889, Feb. 3, 1861.

[3] Correspondence between Weightman and Berret. Washington, 1861. Also *The Star*, Feb. 7, 1861.

[4] *The Star*, Feb. 4, 1861. William H. Seward, then soon to leave the senate to become secretary of state in Lincoln's cabinet, in a letter of Jan. 18, 1861, to his wife, stated he was told the mayor of the city was secretly with the conspiracy to seize the city. Quoted by Rhodes, Vol. 3, p. 300.

---

[1] *The Star*, Jan. 21, 28 and 31, 1861.

[2] The same, Feb. 7, 1861.

[3] The same, Jan. 28, 1861.

[4] The same, Jan. 25, 1861.

[5] The same, Feb. 16, 1861.

[6] The same, Feb. 22, 1861.

It was the opinion of Colonel Stone, at the time, and when he came to write his recollections, twenty years later, he knew of no reason to change it, that the District troops "insured the regular inauguration on the steps of the capitol." For while the procession, with the exception of one company of regulars and the mounted marshals, was made up of local companies, and two of these marched by the side of the presidential carriage, another local company was stationed on the housetops along the line of march, while still another surrounded the platform, leaving the regulars available for other duty.

---

[1] Colonel Stone's narrative, p. 466.

[2] *The Star*, March 4, 1861.

After the inauguration of the president the armed force fell into the background in the other events of the day. The ball was held, but not under military surveillance. On the evening of the following day a concert was given in the inaugural ball-room. The newly installed president held a reception at the White House, where the crowd was so great that regret was expressed that the temporary exit, sometimes used on former occasions, by means of a platform from one of the east room windows, on the north side, had not been provided.[1] In the course of a few weeks Mrs. Lincoln began to hold receptions each Saturday afternoon, when the conservatory erected on the west terrace was thrown open to the callers.[2] But they were slimly attended. Society at first was disposed to hold aloof from the administration, partly because of the contrast to the departed southerners and partly because "the gentry," as an English observer termed some of the citizens of Washington, "are thoroughly Virginia in sentiment."[3] But if the disturbed condition of the union, where two flags floated instead of one, put an end to the customary popular share in the inaugural parade, the scramble for offices, usual on a change of administration, was not affected. To Lincoln, it seemed as if he were "like one sitting in a palace assigning apartments to importunate applicants, while the structure is on fire, and likely soon to perish in ashes."[4] A little more than a month after the inauguration, and on April 9, the day after the South Carolina authorities were notified that provisions would be sent to the garrison at Fort Sumter, the president, realizing that war was soon to come, directed ten companies of the District militia, a force nearly equal to the number of soldiers of the regular army then in the city, outside of the marines, to be mustered into the service of the United States.[5] With this increase in troops, and the creation of the military department of Washington, to consist of the state of Maryland and of the District,[1] the military plan for the protection of the city was enlarged. In addition to guards for the public buildings, picket guards were placed at the bridges, roads, railroad depot, in fact at all the approaches to the city.[2] The morning following the carrying out of this scheme of city protection, and three days after District troops entered the service of the government, the flag floating over Fort Sumter was fired on. At once the country was aflame. The north became as united for the union as the cotton states all along had been against it. President Lincoln's call upon the militia of the states met an enthusiastic response. In Washington, as throughout the north, it was felt, and deeply too, that the honor of the country must be vindicated.[3] The call was issued three days after the firing of what proved to be the opening shot of four years of war. But a week before the air was not electric with patriotism. The union feeling was latent. At that time came the call to the District militia. It came without warning, with no time for consideration or for an arrangement of private affairs. An order was sent to some of the companies to report at their armories for inspection. Upon assembling, the commanding officer was directed to march his men to the war department. There, for the first time, the men were told that they were expected to enter the service of the United States as regular soldiers. It is not surprising that of the six companies that lined up before Major Irwin McDowell, assistant adjutant-general, on the first day, only one was mustered in.[4] As might have been expected, from the care exercised in enrolling the militia, comparatively few held back because of the oath required of all entering the regular military service, pledging allegiance to the United States government. As illustrative of current conditions, some of the spectators, because of their sympathy with the south, urged the men not to take the oath. The next day, when it was understood what was proposed, and especially that they were to be called on for duty only in the District, and for its defence, the mustering was completed, and ten companies were in the service of the United States.[1] Then orders came for additional companies, so that the day after the president made his response to the attack on Fort Sumter, by the proclamation of April 15, calling upon the governors of the states to furnish quotas of the militia, just as he had done, a week before in the District, fourteen additional companies of District militia were in the service of the government, making a total of twenty-four, aggregating between 1200 and 1400 men.[2] By that time the force of regular soldiers had been increased by the addition of some 150 men, so that the number all told at that time, including the marines, was about 1000.[3] After the arrival, on April 19, of the Sixth Massachusetts, the first of the troops to reach the city in response to the call of the president, followed a few hours later by five companies of Pennsylvania troops, the military force was increased by about 1000,[4] making a total defensive force of some 3400.[5] Then the flow of troops ceased, and no more came for five days. As the result of the outbreak of the mob element in Baltimore, through which the Sixth Massachusetts fought its way, the authorities of that city, in order to avoid a repetition of such scenes of violence, and no doubt also influenced by political sympathies, disabled the railroads leading to the north, so that no more troops could be sent. The capital city was completely isolated from the north by rail, and a few days later the telegraph service ended.[6] What was a force of 3400 men, when it was generally expected that Beauregard, with four or five thousand men, would come from Charleston, and reënforced by the Virginia militia, then estimated to number from six to fifteen thousand, would attempt to take the city? The seizure of the city was hotly advocated by the Richmond newspapers, while the confederate secretary of war publicly declared that the stars and bars would soon float over the federal capitol.[1] The situation in Virginia, just across the river, added to the apprehension. On the day of the Baltimore affair, the Virginia convention adopted an ordinance of secession, and while it was to be submitted to a vote of the people more than a month later, yet the result was such a foregone conclusion that three days after this action the secessionists placed the town of Alexandria, eight miles south of Washington, under guard, while troops were assembling in a camp near the municipal limits.[2] A hostile party approached as near to Washington as the southern end of the Long Bridge, and after ransacking the pleasure resort of Columbian, later Rhodes Spring, returned to Alexandria.[3] The confederate flag, as it floated from the Marshall House in Alexandria, was seen in Washington. All traffic on the river ceased, while the Gosport navy yard and the armory at Harper's Ferry, lacking military protection, were abandoned by the government and fell into the hands of the state troops. The isolation of Washington from the north, and the threatening surroundings, created a panic in the city. Some of the citizens sent their families away, while a large number of the temporary residents hurriedly left.[4] In addition to the demands upon the banks for money to supply such needs, which upset the money market,[5] the ordinary food supplies were cut off by the stoppage of freight. The price of food-stuffs advanced.[6] The government seized the flour-mills

---

[1] *The Star*, March 9, 1861.

[2] The same, April 8, 1861. The conservatory was built in 1857 and soon became a feature of social events at the White House.

[3] My Diary, North and South, W. H. Russell, Vol. 1, pp. 78 and 98.

[4] McClure's Lincoln, p. 56.

[5] Rebellion Records, Series 1, Vol. 51, p. 321, April 9, 1861.

---

[1] Rebellion Records, Series 1, Vol. 51, p. 322.

[2] *The Star*, April 13, 1861. Rebellion Records, Series 1, Vol. 51, p. 323.

[3] The same, April 15, 1861.

[4] Rebellion Records, Series 1, Vol. 51, p. 322.

---

[1] *The Star*, April 9 and 11, 1861.

[2] Rebellion Records, Series 1, Vol. 51, p. 324, April 16, 1861. *The Star*, April 17, 1861.

[3] *The Star*, April 13, 1861. *Congressional Globe*, p. 1414, March 2, 1861. The list of regulars in the city April 30, showing a total of 512, as given in Rebellion Records, Series 1, Vol. 51, p. 343, does not include the marines and otherwise is not complete.

[4] *The Star*, April 20, 1861.

[5] See the estimates varying from 5000 to 2500. Rhodes, Vol. 3, note, p. 375.

[6] *The Star*, April 25, 1861. Two days previous a telegraph line for the first time was carried to the White House. The same, April 22.

---

[1] McPherson's Political History, p. 114.

[2] *The Star*, April 22, 1861.

[3] The same, April 24, 1861.

[4] The attendance at the public schools fell off, owing to parents leaving the city. School trustees' report, p. 5, Sept. 1, 1861. In Laws, 58th Council.

[5] *The Star*, April 23, 1861.

[6] The same, April 22 and 25, 1861.

in Georgetown, and the flour on vessels at the wharves for the army bakery that was set up in the basement of the capitol.[1] Then the Washington branch railroad, the link connecting Annapolis Junction with the city, was taken possession of by the government and placed in charge of Colonel Stone, who had been appointed commander of the District troops in the service of the United States.[2] A military censorship on the telegraph service was established that continued throughout the war with irritating as well as discouraging effect on the war correspondents that came swarming into Washington.[3] The defensive force of the city was increased with feverish haste. The evening of the day after the arrival of the troops from their Baltimore experience, a company of sixty, brought together by Senator James H. Lane of Kansas, began nightly guard duty in the east room of the White House, while the clerks in the various departments were formed in companies to serve in connection with the troops assigned for the protection of the buildings.[4] At least 500 soldiers were stationed in the treasury department at night, while the exterior of the first floor was protected by movable barricades, and bags of sand were piled up for breastworks on the porticoes.[5] The mustering into the service of District citizens was at once resumed,[6] and was continued until soon after the New York Seventh Regiment reached Washington, April 25, over the rebuilt line from Annapolis to Annapolis Junction, and demonstrated that communication with the north had been restored. The District representation in the military service was more than doubled. Instead of 1400 men there were over 3000.[7]

---

[1] *The Star*, April 22, 1861.

[2] The same, April 23, 1861.

[3] Poore, Vol. 2, pp. 78 and 127. *The Republican*, Dec. 2, 1865. The office of the censor was in the National Hotel, which was in the vicinity of the telegraph offices. Gobright, p. 320.

[4] *The Star*, April 19, 1861.

[5] The same, April 22.

[6] The same, April 19, 20, 22 and 24, 1861.

[7] The District militia organizations mustered into the service of the United States from April 9 to April 27, when enlistment solely for District defence ceased, are as follows, as furnished by H. P. McClain, adjutant-general U.S.A., from the records of his office: —

The situation changed completely. Confidence was restored, the fears for the safety of the city were dissipated. Two days later the government announced that no more troops would be mustered into the service solely for the defence of the city.[1] Then enlistment of District citizens for general service under the general call began. By the close of the year 1861, 6535 men, including those for service in the District and reënlistments, had been on the rolls, an unusual proportion from a population of 29,585 white males.[2] At the same time the confederate troops were withdrawn from Alexandria to the interior, as a beginning was made of a general rendezvous under Beauregard at Manassas, thirty-five miles to the southwest, at the junction of the railway south with the one west to the Shenandoah Valley. Then communication by the river was again restored.[3] But while the confederate concentration of troops was in a

---

1st Battalion: Co. A, Captain Charles H. Rodier; Co. B, James Goddard; Co. —, J. H. McBlair; Co. —, Robert Boyd.

2d Battalion: Co. A, Edward C. Carrington; Co. B, James Kelly; Co. —, Gabriel J. L. Foxwell; Co. D, John McClelland; Co. E, James N. Callan.

3d Battalion: Co. A, John R. Smead; Co. F, James Fletcher; Co. —, James Elder; Co. —, Henry M. Knight.

4th Battalion: Co. A, Lemuel Towers; Co. B, Samuel A. H. Marks, Jr.; Co. C, Charles J. Morrison; Co. D, Powell J. Tyler.

5th Battalion: Co. A, George Thistleton; Co. B, J. B. Grinnell; Co. —, William H. Degges; Co. —, John McDermott; Co. —, William H. Nalley.

6th Battalion: Co. A, Patrick H. King; Co. C, S. A. H. McKim; Co. E, Richard Morgan; Co. F, W. P. Ferguson.

7th Battalion: Co. C, George W. Miller; Co. D, Jeremiah Cross; Co. —, Robert Clarke; Co. —, Alexander Rutherford.

8th Battalion: Co. A, Joseph Gerhardt; another Co. A, Arthur Balback; Co. B, Waldimir Krzyzanowski.

Cavalry: Owen's Co., Samuel W. Owen.

A total of 34 companies and 3019 men.

[1] *The Star*, April 27, 1861.

[2] Rebellion Records, Series 3, Vol. 4, pp. 94 and 1269. The annual report of the secretary of war, dated Dec. 1, 1861, credits the District at that time with 2823 three-months men and 1000 for the war.

[3] *The Star*, May 4, 1861. A few weeks later the confederates built a battery at the terminus of the Richmond and Fredericksburg Railroad at Aquia Creek and subsequently one at Matthias's Point, but it was not long before the navy secured the control of the river.

country district, remote from a large centre, that of the federals was at Washington, then with a population of 61,000. From that time until the close of the war two distinct communities were maintained in the same locality. It was done so successfully that not once was the civilian government set aside, as was done for a time both in Baltimore and in Richmond. At first, in the haste and excitement of the opening days of a war undertaken by a people unprepared for war, the troops were quartered not merely within the urban bounds, but for the most part in the heart of the city.[1] Then camps were established on the outskirts to the north, and when, the latter part of May, the first forward move was made into the enemy's country, camps were established on the Virginia side of the river, commanding the approaches to the Long and Little Falls Bridges as well as to the city of Alexandria.[2] By the opening of the year 1862 the aqueduct of the Alexandria canal had been changed by the military authorities into a bridge, and that formed another defensive centre.[3] The movement of troops and supplies was facilitated by the building of the city link in the Washington and Alexandria Railway,[4] while, with the occupation of Alexandria by the federals, the general offices and machine shops of the Orange and Alexandria Railroad fell into the hands of the government, and the operation of the road east of Manassas by the company ceased.[5] In the movement into Virginia the District troops led the van, although the large percentage had enlisted only for service in the District. Yet, when the advance was ordered, "not a man shrank, as the secessionists said they would when asked to leave the city."[1] Besides being used in the defence of the immediate approaches to the city, District troops were sent into Virginia[2] and along the upper Potomac to Great Falls, Seneca Creek and Darnestown.[3] What this response to the call to the service of their country meant to a large number who had been able, while on duty in the District, to give a portion of their time to their private affairs, is suggested, and how they had behind them the community is shown by the action of the city council that made an appropriation for the families needing assistance,[4] while John C. Rives, the veteran publisher of the *Congressional Globe*, made a generous provision of the same kind.[5] As soon as the three-months service of the District men was ended and they were mustered out, the First Regiment of District of Columbia Volunteers was formed.[6] This service, as was the case when the local companies went outside of the District, was entirely voluntary, for in the two calls issued by the government up to that time no quota was required of the District. In fact, it was not until the third call came out, the following summer, that the District was included, as it continued to be in all subsequent calls.[7] Even before this call of July 2, 1862, the Second District Regiment was in the field.[8] It may be concluded that, as the first two calls came at a time when the District militia was coming to the assistance of the government in a generous fashion, the District was not included in the quotas asked for from the states. It was hardly an oversight, as only a few months after the president issued his second call, in May, 1861, the District was included when a direct tax was levied on the states.[9] The parting with sons, husbands and sweethearts, the first heartache that war brings, was not an experience in Washington quite as soon as elsewhere. But first of all the communities north and south, with the exception of Charleston, it felt the wide-reaching influence of being suddenly transformed into a military centre. Following the advance into Virginia, a beginning was made in the erection of the forts that in the course of a few years encircled the entire city. But while a portion of the great areas of unoccupied land within the city limits was utilized for camps for soldiers during the early years of the conflict,[1] yet in the course of a few months the large percentage of the 50,000 troops were beyond the urban limits.[2] The city became a vast military centre. There was assembled, equipped and trained the army of the Potomac, perhaps the most effective fighting machine the war produced. Washington was the receiving depot for the recruits. Just to the south of the Baltimore and Ohio depot, at North Capitol and C streets, large frame structures were erected, one of them built from the lumber used in the inaugural ball-room, and having sleeping quarters for 2000 men,[3] while to the north, near E Street, between New Jersey Avenue and North Capitol Street, an extensive frame building was used for the storage of army supplies. But large as that was, it was small in comparison with the great centre of army equipment and supplies that was spread over several acres west of 21st Street, to wharves on the river, and south of G Street. Here were corrals, where thousands of horses and mules were sheltered, and where the harness shops and blacksmith shops were located, and buildings for the forage. It was not long before a force of 1500 men was employed there by the quartermaster's department.[1] To this place were brought the supplies of all sorts needed for the army, while the army bakery, after more than a year in the basement of the capitol, was removed to this locality. In the same vicinity, near the monument, were the slaughter-houses.[2] Before the close of the winter of 1861–1862, which was spent by General McClellan in what came to seem to his contemporaries endless preparation to get his army in condition, the city had been transformed into a vast military depot. But an essential part in the equipment of the fighting machine was the provision made for the care of those incapable of service by disease or wounds. The hospital service was the result of evolution. When the war began, the only hospital in the city, the Washington Infirmary, on Judiciary Square, was taken for the use of the army. Three weeks after the troops began to come, additional hospitals were opened.[3] After the first Bull Run, further provision was made,[4] so that by the close of 1861 there were eleven hospitals, where six months before there had been one.

---

[1] Five days after the coming of the Seventh New York Regiment, 7500 volunteers were quartered in the capitol, the wings of the treasury and patent offices, the navy yard, the city hall and the inaugural ball building adjoining and in several private structures near the public buildings. Rebellion Records, Series 1, Vol. 51, p. 344, April 30, 1861.

[2] Defences of Washington, Barnard, p. 8.

[3] *The Star*, Nov. 22 and Dec. 16, 1861.

[4] The same, June 5, 1861.

[5] 12th Annual Report Orange and Alexandria Railroad, Nov. 7, 1861.

---

[1] *The Star*, May 24, 1861.

[2] The same, June 5, 1861.

[3] The same, June 5, 10 and 22, 1861.

[4] City Ordinance, June 27, 1861.

[5] *The Star*, Nov. 4, 1861.

[6] The same, July 11 and 30, Aug. 8, 1861.

[7] Proceedings, 68th City Council, p. 695. Rebellion Records, Series 3, Vol. 4, p. 1266.

[8] Rebellion Records, Series 3, Vol. 2, p. 183, June 30, 1862.

[9] Stats., 12, 296, Aug. 5, 1861.

---

[1] A camp was located near the eastern city bounds and one near the head of 7th Street, while barracks, subsequently the quarters of the provost guard, were built on Franklin Square. (*The Star*, Aug. 5, 1861.) Also barracks were built in the vicinity of 12th and Q streets northwest (The same, Oct. 24, 1862), and a cavalry station east of the capitol (The same, Aug. 17, 1863), while cavalry stables were erected on the open space between Ohio Avenue, C, 13th and 14th streets. (38th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 5, Dec. 7, 1864.)

[2] Rebellion Records, Series 1, Vol. 5, p. 11. *The Star*, Aug. 5, 1861.

[3] The same, July 26 and 27, 1861.

The following year, to provide for the wounded sent to the city from the peninsular campaign, eleven of the church buildings in Washington and Georgetown were used, for a few months, for the convalescents from the other hospitals.[1] In addition, the army barracks in and about the city, vacated by troops as they were sent to the front, were utilized as hospitals, and also frame structures were built. The earliest type used was pavilions built at right angles from a central structure, and later on, detached pavilions were found to be more suitable.

---

[1] *The Star*, Aug. 7 and 29, Sept. 20, Oct. 28, 1861; *The Republican*, Aug. 19 and 23, 1861.

[2] *The Star*, Sept. 21, 1861.

[3] The same, July 16, 1861. The Union Hotel at the northeast corner of 30th and M streets northwest, two residences on the north side of C Street between 4½ and 6th streets northwest and a residence on 1st between B and C streets northeast used for contagious cases.

[4] The Miss English school building at the northeast corner of 30th and N streets, known as the Seminary Hospital, Columbian College building and a private house on E Street between 5th and 6th streets northwest were occupied. Before the end of 1861 a wing of the patent office was fitted up for hospital use, and also the residence of the late Stephen A. Douglas, 205 I Street northwest, the Naval Hospital building at Pennsylvania Avenue and 10th Street southeast and a house at the southeast corner of K and 23d streets northwest, standing on the site of a residence which at one time was occupied by Henry Stephen Fox, the British minister, and several of his successors. *The Star*, Sept. 10, 1861.

Of the thirty-six hospitals opened during the war in the District, exclusive of the temporary use of the churches, twenty-three were located in the two towns, while the balance, for the most part, were just beyond the northern municipal limits.[2] Surrounded by camps of soldiers, the centre of an extensive hospital service and the base of supplies, the course of community life was radically affected, but it was not destroyed. Civilian government was maintained, but always subordinate to the supreme authority of the government that found its chief expression in the military. For in two days after communication with the north was resumed, the writ of habeas corpus was suspended along the military line from Washington to Philadelphia, while in less than two weeks later, a provost guard patrolled the streets at night.[3] At the same time, the civil police continued on duty. Both used the same station-houses, and each morning an army officer sat with the police magistrate, and divided with him the cases, as civilian or soldier was arraigned.[4] The commitments of both were to the city jail. The jurisdiction of the military police had a wider scope than merely the preservation of order, as under the orders of the secretaries of state or of war, men and women whose loyalty was suspected were placed under arrest. In the course of a couple of months after the war began, the military authorities leased the old capitol building at the northeast corner of 1st and A streets northeast, then occupied as a public school, and turned it into a military prison.[1] It came to be used almost exclusively as a place of detention for the class known as state prisoners, while those charged with infractions of military discipline were confined in a building at the southeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 13th Street, which was leased by the government.[2] By the fall, and four months after the old capitol prison was opened, only fifteen prisoners suspected of disloyalty had been sent there.[3] Then the arrests became so numerous that two of the houses in the Carroll or Duff Green row, on the square to the south, were secured to provide for the overflow.[4] In spite of the night service of the provost guard, military discipline, in the opening months of the war, was not sufficiently effective to keep the soldiers out of the city. A pay day was followed by drunken and disorderly occurrences.[5] The situation in these particulars was not improved by the demoralization in the army that followed the panicky flight from the field of the first Bull Run, and especially by the expiration of the service of three-months men, many of whom remained in the city.[6] When, ten days after Bull Run, General George B. McClellan was given the command,[7] with the insight of the capable army organizer that he was, he attempted to remedy what he saw was a grave defect in "the streets of Washington, crowded with straggling officers and men, absent from their stations without authority, whose behavior indicated the great want of discipline and organization."[1] Then he issued an order, directing that no officer or soldier be allowed to be absent from his command and visit Washington except on public duty.[2] But only the self-sufficiency of General McClellan warranted his comment that this course resulted in "the restoration of order" and that Washington "became one of the quietest towns in the country." On the same day of this military order, the mayor coöperated by directing that all saloons be closed at nine instead of twelve o'clock each night. But as existing laws placed no limit on the hours of hotel bars and restaurants, the traffic was only partially limited. Then, too, another class of places had sprung up, where admission was charged, some slight performance was given and drinks were served by waitresses. As may be imagined, most of these places were dives of the lowest character, frequented by men and women who preyed upon the soldier. Congress also lent a hand by prohibiting, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, the sale of liquor to soldiers.[3] The order of the commanding general became no more effective —although a guard was detailed to patrol the streets during the day as well as during the night,[4] while a guard was provided in Georgetown[5]—than the congressional and municipal efforts to restrain the liquor traffic.[6] No doubt existing as well as prior conditions had an influence on congress in finally enacting into law the long-pending legislation providing a federal police for the city. At once, in anticipation of the carrying out of this law, the appropriation for the auxiliary guard, or night police, was discontinued by congress, while the city council, glad of a chance to lessen the demand on the city revenues, that had not as yet recovered from the stringency of the opening months of the war, discontinued the day police. For a period of some twelve days, pending the organization of the new force, the only guardian of the city's peace was the provost guard. The guard also took possession of the keys of the fire-engine houses, but apparently only for the purpose of caring for the property, as most of the members of the companies were in the military or other service of the government,[1] but did not attempt to man the machines. At any rate, no change was made in the indifferent character of the service, as two months later, when the hospital building on Judiciary Square was destroyed by fire, at an early hour in the morning, no company appeared on the scene for an hour after the alarm was given.[2] The following month came the first warning of the danger to which government property was exposed in the numerous wooden buildings hastily thrown up, when a destructive fire broke out in the government corral.[3] Nearly a year passed before anything was done. Then a steam fire-engine, the first to be located in the city, was ordered from Philadelphia by the secretary of war, with experienced men to handle it, under the command of William Dickson. The new company was stationed near the government corral, occupying the house of the Union Fire Company at 19th and H streets northwest.[4] For a couple of years the two fire departments, at first not without friction and jealousy, — for the long-standing defect of the volunteer system, the lack of control and discipline, was still manifest,[5] — served together in putting out fires whether in public or private property.[6] Shortly after the government fire service was established, the city councils, after discussing a reorganization of the city fire service, finally adopted a system that was a compromise between a paid and a volunteer corps.[7]

---

[1] *The Star*, June 14, 1862. At that time there were over 4000 patients. Report on army hospitals in the District. The same, June 18, 1862.

[2] Toner's Anniversary Oration, p. 61.

[3] *The Star*, May 6 and 9, 1861.

[4] Serious offences were tried by court-martial, as in the instance of a soldier who shot his sergeant. The sentence of a court-martial of hanging was carried out on "the commons" between O and P streets near Vermont Avenue. *The Star*, Jan. 6, 1862.

---

[1] *The Star*, July 5, 1861.

[2] The same, Aug. 23, 1861. The warehouse of George Waters on the canal near 32d Street was also used for court-martial prisoners. The same, March 21, 1862.

[3] Rebellion Records, Series 2, Vol. 2, p. 223.

[4] *The Star*, May 30, 1862.

[5] The same, June 27, 1861.

[6] The same, July 27, 1861.

[7] He leased the residence 1607 H Street northwest. (*The Star*, Nov. 12, 1861.) His headquarters the first year were a frame building at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Place, where the military department of Washington was located. (*Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 16, 1869.)

---

[1] Rebellion Records, Series 1, Vol. 5, p. 11.

[2] *The Star*, July 31, 1861.

[3] Stats., 12, 291, Aug. 5, 1861.

[4] *The Star*, Aug. 2, 1861.

[5] The same, Aug. 12, 1861. The headquarters were at Forrest Hall on the west side of 32d Street just north of M Street.

[6] See the *Star* of Oct. 4, 1861, and references in subsequent issues.

---

[1] *The Star*, Aug. 31, 1861.

[2] The same, Nov. 4, 1861.

[3] The same, Dec. 27, 1861.

[4] The same, Sept. 20, 1862. The following year the government added two more steam-engines to the service. The same, July 24, 1863.

[5] The same, June 9, 1862. Inaugural address of the mayor.

[6] A month after the Philadelphia company came to the city it responded when Ford's Theatre on 10th Street between E and F streets was destroyed by fire, but was delayed in arriving because the engine stuck fast in the mud of the unpaved streets at Pennsylvania Avenue and 13th Street. *The Star*, Dec. 31, 1862.

[7] Ordinance, Nov. 13, 1862. *The Star*, Nov. 15, 1862. For the first time firemen were placed on the city salary roll, as J. J. Peabody, who

In less than two years, due in large part to the improved financial condition of the city, the last vestiges of the volunteer system were swept away by the establishment of a paid department under the direction of a board of fire commissioners, appointed by the city council. Three steam-engines were purchased, and a fire-alarm and a police telegraph installed.[1] For six years, from 1863 to 1869, the city and the general government shared equally the cost of the fire service, as each maintained three engines. While the Metropolitan or federal police at this period exercised its functions, and the customary civil processes and forms were maintained, and the courts were open, yet, after all, the soldier, set above all law, was the supreme authority. It was a power exercised for the most part with discretion and moderation. The citizens who lived for months before the first Bull Run Battle and for months after, under the dread and apprehension of a hostile attack on the city, came to regard the rule of the military as part of the price of security.[2] They submitted to this rule, so direct in its methods and so different from accustomed forms that it brought for the first time to the knowledge of citizens a notion of what was meant by the power of government. For example, the law in force, familiar to citizens, provided punishment for those found guilty of selling liquor to citizens. But under the rule of the provost guard the proprietors of the place where it was charged the violation of the law took place were not only arrested, but, without warrant of law, the stock of liquor was poured into the gutter.[3] Another extra legal restriction was imposed by the military, in requiring hotels and restaurant keepers to sign a pledge not to sell to soldiers.[4] Such a course was not merely the expression of arbi-

---

was elected chief engineer by the new fire department, composed of delegates from each company, was paid, as was also J. H. Thompson, the assistant engineer.

[1] Ordinances, March 12 and April 25, 1864. Also message of the mayor. Proceedings 63d Council, p. 21, June 26, 1865.

[2] *The Star*, May 23, 1862.

[3] The same, Jan. 8, 1862, and April 17, 1863.

[4] The same, March 17, 1863.

trary power. It resulted in the prompt enforcement of the law. For Judge Merrick of the circuit court had ruled, only a few months before, that such cases must be held under bail for trial in the criminal court instead of being disposed of in a magistrate's court that sat daily, and not, as the higher court did, twice a year.[1] It is quite evident, if the stock of liquor was destroyed when the arrest was made, that the sale could not go on as would happen if the court handled the case and the accused was at large under bail. At the same time, it is not likely, when the military dealt in its summary fashion with a liquor dealer's stock, that it had regard for a decision rendered by John H. Walter, a magistrate, that as lager beer was not intoxicating, it did not come within the provisions of the law.[2] The city authorities contributed nothing to the contest with the liquor evil in the way of regulative or restrictive legislation. The only liquor ordinance enacted from 1854 to the close of the corporation form of government in 1871 was that of Oct. 31, 1864, which was designed as a revenue measure, and made no change in the restrictions. In fact, the traffic had a broader scope, as legal recognition was given to licenses for bar-rooms or tippling houses for the first time in ten years. At the same time, a temperance sentiment existed in the community, as shown by some activity on the part of the Washington Total Abstinence Society,[3] which, in 1862, asked the president to prohibit the sale of liquor in the District.[4] The kindred vices of gambling and prostitution[5] increased to an unheard-of extent, but no attempt was made to check them, except as the provost guard at times raided houses of prostitution. The opinion was held that what was recognized as an excessive development of these evils that had always existed in the city would disappear when normal conditions were once more restored.[6] In its method of dealing with thieves and vagabonds the provost guard was not only extrajudicial, but unsocial. For, after arresting a number of persons, who no doubt would have been shown by due process to be offenders, if it had been thought worth while to give the time to the cases, each one was labelled with a huge red placard, bearing the words, "pickpocket or thief," and then, preceded by a fife and drum corps, playing the Rogue's March, were paraded through the streets to the depot.[1] After this lot of undesirables were on the train, and the city was free from their presence, the military authorities had no further concern about them or what they might do in the next community.

---

[1] *The Star*, Oct. 9, 1861.

[2] The same.

[3] The same, July 29, 1862.

[4] The same, April 17, 1863.

[5] The same, Aug. 26, 1862, April 7 and Nov. 12, 1863.

[6] The same, Oct. 27, 1863.

The directness and celerity of action under military rule was illustrated in the case of James G. Berret. As the mayor of the city, he was designated, in the law establishing the Metropolitan Police, an ex officio member of the board of commissioners, as was also Henry Addison, the mayor of Georgetown. But Mr. Berret alone refused to take the oath of allegiance, as required of all government officials by a recent act. For as the board was appointed by the president, and was directed to report to the secretary of the interior, it was held to be a part of the government service. The mayor, however, did not so interpret the law, and furthermore, with a swollen feeling of official importance, maintained that by taking the oath as a government employé, he would give color to the pretension that "the chief magistrate of the city, elected by popular suffrage, is in any sense an employé or dependent to any extent upon either of the executive departments of the government." [2] If the usual civil process had been followed, either the mayor's interpretation of the law would have been accepted or the board would have been incomplete until congress amended the law. But in four days' time an opinion of the attorney-general, adverse to the mayor's position, had been given,[3] and the mayor himself was on his way to Fort Lafayette.[1] Two days later the city council elected Richard Wallach, who was already a member of the police board, acting mayor of the city,[2] and the vacancy on the board was soon filled by a presidential appointment.[3] This method of dealing with Mayor Berret was typical of a period when all laws gave way to the fundamental right of a government to protect its own existence. No charges were preferred, and no hearing was given. The arrest was made by the provost guard on an order from the secretary of state. After twenty-two days of confinement, Mr. Berret was set at liberty, by order from the same source, after complying with the conditions that he take the oath of allegiance and resign as mayor of the city. He returned at once to his home in the city. While contemporary opinion, on the one hand, attributed Mr. Berret's course to secession sympathies,[4] and on the other hand, to local political influences,[5] yet, from his own statement, it is evident he was carried away with the thought of his official dignity and importance. For when the grounds of the objection no longer existed, that is, he was no longer mayor of the city, he took the oath. A year later, when the commission was appointed to award to owners compensation for slaves freed in the District, President Lincoln appointed him a member, an honor which, however, he declined.

---

[1] *The Star*, April 3, 1863.

[2] *Intelligencer*, Aug. 27, 1861. Opinion of the corporation council, James M. Carlisle, submitted by the mayor as a defence of his course.

[3] *The Star*, Aug. 24, 1861.

A short time after the Berret arrest a somewhat similar incident occurred. For the first time a check was attempted on the power of the provost guard. William M. Merrick, one of the judges of the circuit court, issued a writ of habeas corpus in the case of a man arrested by the provost guard. Instead of resting content with a refusal to obey the writ, the military authorities that night placed a sentinel in front and another in the rear of the residence occupied by the judge. No attempt was made to restrain his personal liberty, yet the judge so construed the presence of the soldiers. Instead of attending court the next morning, he notified his colleagues by letter of the circumstance. The latter resolved to make a test of power with the military authorities, and directed that General Andrew Porter, in command of the provost guard, be summoned for contempt. The marshal informed the court that he had been directed by the president of the United States not to serve the writ, and that was the end of the matter and Judge Merrick resumed his duties.[1]

---

[1] Rebellion Records, Series 2, Vol. 2, p. 237, Aug. 24, 1861; also pp. 229, 596.

[2] *The Star*, Aug. 27, 1861.

[3] The members of the board were George S. Gideon (*The Star*, Sept. 8, 1861), Joseph F. Brown and Zenas C. Robbins of Washington, Wm. H. Tenney of Georgetown and Sayles J. Bowen of Washington County, Richard Wallach, mayor of Washington, and Henry Addison, mayor of Georgetown, ex officio. *The Star*, Aug. 16, 1861.

[4] The same, Aug. 20, 1861.

[5] The same, Oct. 15, 1861.

Seven months later, a decision of the commission whose duty it was to pass upon cases coming under the fugitive slave law, which continued in force, as to slaves of loyal owners, until congress repealed the law in 1864, was not agreeable to some one in authority. Forthwith, a demand was made by the provost guard upon Benedict Milburn, the jailer of the District, for a girl, committed by order of the commission, and then upon George W. Phillips, the assistant United States marshal. When they refused, they were arrested and locked up in the Central Guard-house, the headquarters of the provost guard. The jail was left in charge of the guards. It was only by appeal to the president that the military grip was relaxed and the civil law officials set at liberty.[2]

[1] *The Star*, Oct. 22 and 26, 1861.

[2] The same, May 23, 1862.

CHAPTER XVII

A CHANGED CITY

Public sentiment throughout the country became impatient as the months went on, after the failure of the first Bull Run, and the army of the Potomac was still about Washington. As is now known, the delay was not due to any lack in the military preparation, but to the infirmity of will of the commanding general. For during the fall and winter of 1861–1862 the government spent lavishly in providing for the equipment and care of the companies and regiments that came pouring into Washington. As the centre of all this activity, the city was transformed. The change was rapid in its course and radical in its character. For Washington had not only suffered from the unsettling influences of the times, which had prostrated business throughout the country, but its population had fallen off. To meet this condition the tax rate was not merely reduced, but cut in half.[1]

The building of schoolhouses of an inexpensive type, that had been going on for two years at an unusual rate, was stopped for want of funds.[2] Such was the stringency of the times, that it was found impossible to even make a start in the erection of the Centre Market-house, which congress had encouraged by ceding to the city the site, on condition of building within two years, and further granting authority to increase the funded debt by making a loan of $200,000.[1] Men were thrown out of employment by the stoppage of all government building — the extension of the capitol and the completion of the aqueduct being the principal works at that time.[2] Then the recovery set in at a more rapid rate than the decline, for only five months after the war opened the volume of business in Washington exceeded all previous records.[3] Rents advanced as the supply of buildings became exhausted, but it was not until the following spring there was enough confidence to warrant the beginning, even in a slight way, of building operations.[4] Men for military and other services were in such demand that the fire companies were crippled, while even the attendance at the public schools was affected, as boys left their studies to take employment at the navy yard and arsenal.[5] Some of the local business men, in the course of a few years, made fortunes.[6] For the first time in the history of the city the hotels were crowded when congress was not in session, and also for the first time the business became highly profitable.[7] The census taken was not needed to establish the fact of the city's growth,[8] for the record of a swelling population was found in the thronged streets, the crowded hotels, the growing volume of business and the increase in the number of government employés.[9] It was recorded also in the change made when the old-time finger-posts at the corners, bearing the names of the streets, were done away with, and the names were placed on the street-lamps, where they could be seen at night as well as in daylight.[1] When the free delivery service was established in 1863, Washington was one of the cities to have the convenience of street letter-boxes.[2] Then the warring interests, that had for eight years been trying to get from congress a street railway charter, were dominated by the influence of Jay Cooke, the Philadelphia banker, who secured the charter. In this, as in the larger field of government fiscal affairs, which he had entered the previous fall when he undertook to place the 7.30 bonds as a popular loan, he made use of the acquaintance with public affairs and men of his brother, Henry D. Cooke.[3] The latter, as the editor of the Columbus, Ohio, *Statesman*, as well as an agreeable man of high personal character, had formed a close acquaintance with Salmon P. Chase, then secretary of the treasury, but not long before, governor of Ohio, and also with John Sherman, senator from that state, and other public men. As a newspaper writer, Mr. Cooke came to Washington to attend the inauguration, and when his brother, who had from his abundant means been supplying the annual deficit of the Ohio newspaper, made the suggestion that he could be of use in assisting him to carry out plans which he had formed of entering into government financial affairs, Henry D. Cooke turned from journalism to banking. He was then thirty-seven years of age, had been admitted to the bar, had a taste of diplomatic service as attaché at Valparaiso, Chile, and had edited newspapers in Philadelphia and in Ohio. During the fall of 1861 Mr. Cooke, as special agent for the treasury department, travelled about the country, placing the 7.30 bonds. Under the direction of his brother, he looked after street railway matters in Washington the following winter. After the charter was obtained the struggle was renewed in part to get control of the stock, which, as the law required, was offered at public subscription.[1] The change in the circumstances of the residents of the city since the last attempt was made to finance a public utility, when the gas company was formed, is indicated to some extent by the fact that the local subscriptions alone amounted to more than the entire capital stock of $300,000. As the stock was over-subscribed some nineteen times, the local allotment was not large.[2] The company more than met the requirement of the charter, designed to prevent its speculative use, as the entire line was in operation in less than the stipulated six months. While the stock control was in out-of-town hands, yet the personnel of the management was residential. Two of the representatives of the owners of the property, Henry D. Cooke and Harris C. Fahnestock, the latter a capable young man whom the discerning judgment of Jay Cooke had discovered in a Harrisburg bank, where he was getting a salary of $1200,[3] had been for some months resident of the city, as they were in charge of the Washington branch of Jay Cooke and Co.[4] Mr. Cooke became the president of the Washington and Georgetown Street Railway Co. and Mr. Fahnestock the treasurer. Towards the close of the first year Mr. Cooke resigned and became president of the First National Bank, a Jay Cooke enterprise,

---

[1] In 1860 the net rate, after allowing for a 5 per cent reduction for prompt payment, was 60 cents, while the following year, including a similar rebate of 20 per cent, it fell to 30 cents. The next year, although a 15 per cent rebate was allowed, the net rate was again 60 cents.

[2] In Laws, 58th Council, appendix, p. 13; School report, Sept. 1, 1861.

---

[1] Stats., 12, 14, May 9, 1860.

[2] 37th Cong., 3d Sess., House Doc. No. 1, Dec. 1, 1862. Report of secretary of the interior.

[3] *The Star*, Oct. 3, 1861.

[4] The same, April 26, 1862.

[5] The same, June 9, 1862. Also school trustees' report. In Laws, 58th Council, p. 11, Sept. 1, 1861. The penitentiary building became a part of the arsenal, the prisoners being sent to Albany. *The Star*, Oct. 10, 1862. Also 37th Cong., 3d Sess., House Doc. No. 1, p. 663, Dec. 1, 1862.

[6] Washington Correspondent of *New York Express*, quoted in the *Star* of Nov. 25 and Dec. 31, 1863.

[7] *The Star*, Sept. 14, 1863. Willard's, Kirkwood, Metropolitan and the National were the leading hotels.

[8] The police board reported in 1863, 140,000 in the city (*The Star*, Dec. 23), when the census of 1860 had found only 61,122 in the city and 75,080 in the entire District.

[9] By the summer of 1862 work was begun in adding a story to both the war and navy department buildings.

---

[1] *The Star*, April 26, 1862.

[2] The same, July 29, 1863. No change was made until six years later in the inadequate system of house numbering which came into use seven years before the breaking out of the war. (The same, Aug. 9, 1854.) Not until the passage of the ordinance of Nov. 29, 1869, was the existing system adopted.

[3] Jay Cooke the Financier of the Civil War, p. 128.

---

[1] No attention was paid by congress to the request of the city council, unusual for that period, that a charter be granted to the city. Even if congress had adopted the alternative plan proposed by the city council, that the city be given the right to sell the charter, it would have resulted in the public getting something for a valuable privilege that was given away. (Joint Resolution, Dec. 21, 1861.) The city councils also favored the building of the road by the general government. (Joint Resolution, January, 1862.)

[2] *The Star*, May 26, 1862.

[3] The Jay Cooke failure in 1873 left Mr. Fahnestock with hardly anything. He was able to retrieve his fortunes, became vice-president of the First National Bank of New York city, and when he died in 1914, he was many times a millionnaire.

[4] *The Star*, Feb. 5, 1862. The office was opened in the building at the northeast corner of 15th and F streets.

"the first association to make application" under the law of 1863 establishing the national bank system.[1]

While a street-car franchise covering, as the charter did, the principal thoroughfares of the city had long been recognized as valuable, yet owing to the changes due to the war, the earnings from the very outset went beyond what must have been the most sanguine expectations. For hardly six months after the road was completed, and in less than a year after the charter was granted, a dividend was declared of nine per cent on the entire capital stock, then increased to $500,000. As but $200,000 was paid in, the road being mainly built from a bond issue of $300,000, the dividend was really 20¼ per cent.[2] The charter, unlimited as to time and making no charge for the use of the streets, was the usual one granted by city councils of that day, although the Baltimore council furnished a notable exception when, a few years before, it required, in the first street railroad charter, the payment to the city of a percentage of the gross receipts. Congress made no change when two years later a charter was granted to the Metropolitan Railway Co. In both instances the companies were required to pave the space occupied by the tracks, and were made subject, in the use and maintenance of the road, to municipal regulations, while the right of public regulation was asserted in the requirement that annual reports be made to congress.[3]

The Metropolitan Co. did not repeat the success of the pioneer company, for by the end of the first year the only part of the line in operation was from the capitol to 17th Street, via the city hall, F and H streets, and that was not paying.[1]

---

[1] *The Star*, Sept. 30, 1863. Ground was purchased on 15th Street, now included in the site of the Riggs building, where a marble-front building was erected with offices for Jay Cooke and Co. on the first floor and for the bank on the second floor.

The other District banks came into the system as follows: Merchants Bank, Bank of Commerce of Georgetown, 1864; Metropolitan Bank, Bank of the Republic, 1865; Farmers and Mechanics Bank of Georgetown and the Bank of Washington 1872 and 1885 respectively.

[2] The same, April 6, 1863. 38th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc., Jan. 16, 1864.

[3] Up to 1872 the Washington and Georgetown Co. construed annual reports to mean reports to each congress once in every two years, while the Metropolitan line did not begin its annual reports until 1878.

While these phases of the early stages of the change, that turned the straggling village community of the Nation's capital into a bustling growing centre, were material, yet they had a deeper significance. In their essence they were tokens of faith in the government and its future, just as could be said of the unusual spectacle, during the special session of congress in the summer of 1861, of entire coöperation of the legislative and executive departments and also of the unshaken attitude of calm confidence of the president. The latter was shown in many ways, but perhaps in none that had a wider sweep in its influence than the simple act, nine days after the wracking suspense of the city's isolation had been relieved, in having the Marine Band continue the custom of years when it resumed its season of open-air concerts.[2] Then again in less than a month after the panic of the First Bull Run, work was resumed on the capitol extension and dome.[3] At the customary time of the year for such functions an evening reception at the White House was held,[4] and when an Italian opera company appeared at the Washington Theatre, the President and Mrs. Lincoln attended.[5] Then it was the only theatre in the town, as Odd Fellows Hall and the old assembly-rooms on the south side of Louisiana Avenue, just east of 6th Street, which had just been changed into a place of amusement,[6] were used for variety shows. In the course of a few months John T. Ford of Baltimore, associated with citizens, changed the old edifice of the First Baptist Church, on the east side of 10th Street between E and F streets, into a theatre.[1] By that time a New National Theatre had risen on the ruins of the old structure,[2] and by the end of the year 1862 four theatres were open,[3] where there had been but one less than two years before. Professing to cater to the amusement-loving public, but really traps for the soldier fresh from the camp with money in his pocket, were a host of concert and dance halls that flourished for a while and then disappeared, not infrequently as the result of a provost-guard raid.

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 1029, Feb. 23, 1865. By three successive acts the time limit for the completion of the entire line was extended to 1874.

[2] *The Star*, April 29, 1861.

[3] The same, Aug. 12, 1861. A little more than two years later, when the statue of liberty was raised to its place on the newly completed dome, a salute from the forts about the city was fired. The same, Dec. 2, 1863.

[4] The same, Dec. 18, 1861.

[5] The same, Jan. 24, 1862.

[6] The same, Nov. 13, 1861. Afterwards well known as the Canterbury.

When the spring of 1862 came, so tranquillized was the public mind that interest was revived in base-ball, for the gloom following the Bull Run fiasco was lifting, General McClellan had begun at last his long-expected advance on Richmond, while congress was busy in its experimental legislative garden, testing processes of ridding the District of slavery and of dealing with citizens, alleged to be southern sympathizers, that might be useful in the wider field of the Nation. At this period throngs gathered about the base-ball diamond on the reservation between the grounds of the White House and B Street and watched the contests between the National and Potomac nines.[4] Then the game was a good deal of a novelty, as it had been confined to the north and east. During the season of 1860, however, it had been seen for the first time in Washington,[5] but the following year, on account of current conditions and not from lack of interest, the game was not played.

---

[1] *The Star*, Dec. 5, 1861 and March 17, 1862.

[2] The same, April 23, 1862.

[3] The same, Dec. 22, 1862.

[4] The same, April 23, 1862. This section of the public grounds, then entirely unimproved, is now a part of the park system of the city and is used in part as a public base-ball ground. Its popular name now as then is the White Lot. See commissioner of public buildings' report for 1867.

[5] The Potomac Base-ball Club, the first in the city and the pioneer organization in the south, was organized in the fall of 1859. (*The Star*, Nov. 4, 1859 and Sept. 8, 1860.) The following spring the National Club was organized, and also the Pithean and a number of minor organizations. (The same, May 5, 1860.) The Nationals, who wore a uniform of dark blue pants and jackets and red belts with jockey caps and chamois leather gaiters. "well clogged at heels and ball," were defeated by the Potomacs, who wore a similar uniform except the color was gray. The score was 38 to 32.

While all the phases of community life were affected by the stir of changing conditions, the municipal government, during the first three years of the war, formed an exception that, after all, was not remarkable, as it did not exercise two of the chief functions of such a government, the policing of the city and the improvement of the streets. The former was being well done by the general government, but the latter was not done at all, except in a limited way and by a method that was more suitable for a village than for a town.

For all the city had the power to do in the way of street improvements was grading and gravelling. If, however, a majority of the abutting property holders on a street gave their consent, then the city was at liberty to lay a sidewalk or a street pavement and assess the cost against the property. As a result of this system, imposed by the charter of 1848, Washington streets were without the cobble or rubble pavement current in cities of that day, except sections of 7th and 9th streets, and a square here and there. It is true, Pennsylvania Avenue was paved from the capitol to Georgetown, but that was done by the general government.[1] In less than six months after the opening of the war the longest stretch of pavement, that on Pennsylvania Avenue, became so grooved and hammered by the army wagons and the increased traffic, that its surface suggested that of corrugated iron roofing.[2] In places the pavement was buried under more than ten inches of mud, tracked from the unpaved cross streets.[3] For it was not long before the traffic, so unusual in character and in volume, churned the frail gravel surface, the prevailing method of municipal street improvement, into "fearful canals of almost unfathomable mud."[4] Then when the dry weather came, these canals changed into sloughs of dust, so that during the war period, and even into the next decade, mud and dust were the distinctive features of the Nation's capital. "The number of private carriages is very few," an English traveller notes in the winter of 1862, "and people are afraid of bringing good horses to be mired by the rut tracks which serve the purposes of streets in Washington. The city is in fact an overgrown watering-place." [1] For more than a decade such continued to be the state of the Washington streets, modified, however, by the falling off in the heavy traffic after the war and the paving of some additional street sections. The inadequacy of civic effort, as well as the holding aloof by congress, can be attributed in a broad sense to the plan of the city. For this period of transition was also a test of the fitness of the opulent plan for the uses of a national centre. The time had come to compute in terms of square yards the paving of the broad sweep of the great avenues and of the rectangular intersecting streets, and the result both to congress and to the citizens was discouraging. As the secretary of the interior, John P. Usher of Indiana, who represented federal interests in the city, concluded, "The great width of the streets quite discourages any attempt to completely pave them." [2] Nearly two decades before, congress was under the influence of such a feeling, when it undertook for the first time to lay a city pavement on Pennsylvania Avenue. Then an attempt was made to reduce the cost by leaving unpaved a central strip, having only the cheaper surface of gravel. That proved unsatisfactory, and then the cobblestone pavement was completed from curb to curb. After that no more city paving was done by congress.[3] However, provision was made from the federal treasury from year to year, which, according to the reports of the commissioner of public buildings, was inadequate for repairs to the Pennsylvania Avenue pavement. As had been the usual practice, no other street was touched, unless some federal interest was to be benefited. This was the motive for the exceptional street expenditures in the period just before 1850, thus maintaining, rather lamely, it is true, the theory that the care of the streets was a matter purely for the municipal government.[1] This theory was disregarded by the secretary of the interior, who proposed, in his annual report in 1863, that the government pay a part of the cost of city street work. For while he thought the width of the streets was discouraging, yet he believed that obstacle could be overcome by providing a park space between the building line and the sidewalk, in the case of some streets, thus reducing the paving space, and a central strip in the case of other streets.[2] When street paving was undertaken in any adequate measure, nearly a decade later, this plan was carried out. It has given the city that most-admired as well as unusual feature, a lawn space, or, as it has been called, a front yard to every house. In addition it has accomplished the object of both the early and later advocates, as it is ornamental and also economical.

---

[1] In 1863, according to the *Baltimore Sun* (issue of May 21), the street paving by the city government was confined to the following streets: 7th Street from Maryland Avenue to L Street, 9th Street from Pennsylvania Avenue to G Street, C Street from 3d to 4½ streets, D Street from 7th to 10th streets.

[2] 37th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 1, p. 848, Dec. 3, 1861. Report of commissioner of public buildings.

[3] *The Star*, Feb. 10, 1863.

[4] The same, Nov. 18, 1862.

---

[1] Six Months in the Federal States, Edward Dicey, p. 94.

[2] 38th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc., Dec. 5, 1863. Also letter of the mayor of Washington to the secretary of the interior, 1865.

[3] While in later years 15th and 17th streets in front of the public buildings were improved by the general government in similar fashion, as was also the section of 12th and 14th streets through the Mall, yet they were the slight exceptions that proved the rule.

A still longer anticipation of the future, more especially of the financial relations of the general government and of the District, is to be found in Secretary Usher's plan for carrying out a system of street improvements and sewerage. It was to be done by a commission composed of representatives both of the general and of the local governments. Congress was to provide money in such proportions to that provided by the city as should be determined by law. The secretary further suggested that the city might be required by law to raise its quota by taxation.

---

[1] The largest street improvement made by congress after 1850 was the grading in 1866 of Virginia Avenue to provide a thoroughfare to the navy yard and similar work done the same year on East Capitol Street to improve the outlook from the capitol.

[2] The building line parking device was originally proposed in the senate by Stephen A. Douglas, but his object at that period was solely, of course, to improve the appearance of the city. *Congressional Globe*, p. 2424, Aug. 28, 1852.

No doubt the citizens were gratified by the advocacy coming from such an influential source of a policy, as far as federal participation was concerned, that the District had always favored as well as from time to time a few members of congress and an occasional executive officer, but which had never been accepted by congress. At the same time the natural glow of approbation was chilled by the further observation that the secretary had been unable to convince himself of the justice of imposing the entire support of the police system upon the federal government, forgetting or ignoring the circumstance that the station-houses, warmed and heated, were provided at the expense of the District.

He saw no reason why the city should not bear the cost of its protection, especially as the tax burden was less than that in any of the principal cities of the country. This double-edged sword became all the sharper when congress promptly acted on the police expense suggestion, and required the District to pay about one-third.[1] This discussion of the relations of the District and the general government as property owners had no further effect on legislation, although it was sent to congress at the opening of the session during which the law was enacted, which was thought at the time to mark the beginning of a new era, and was in fact the earliest phase of the movement to make the Nation's capital worthy of its name.[2] For this law was the citizens' plan to provide needed public improvements. It freed the city government from limitations that made it impossible to have a street paved, or lighted, or sewered,[3] without first getting the consent of abutting property owners, who then were taxed to pay for the work. At the same time it introduced an innovation in the current practice in American cities of that day, as well as to a large extent of the present day,[1] by providing that the cost should come from the general tax fund instead of from a tax on abutting property. For about a year and a half prior to the passage of the law of 1864, or since the summer of 1862, the city government had made various efforts to bring about a change in street conditions. Appeals both to congress and the property holder had failed. The general government was asked, by formal resolution of the city council, not merely once, but twice, to repair the damage to the streets by the army wagons.[2] Congress not being responsive either to the request for direct aid or to one asking for enlarged powers, so that the city could help itself,[3] an appeal was made to the next in point of authority and power in this particular, the property holder. The city council offered to pay one-third of the expense if the owner would only consent to permit public streets to be paved.[4] In case the property holder felt any doubt about the need of changing existing street methods, the preamble of the council resolution assured him that "experience has demonstrated that the system heretofore pursued by this corporation, of gravelling the streets, has been attended with vast expense and no permanent good."

---

[1] Stats., 13, 159, June 25, 1864. Four years later the District's share was increased to one-half. (The same, 15, 116, July 20, 1868.) In 1860 the per capita taxation was about $5.22 and in 1863 about $4.27.

[2] The same, 12, 68, May 5, 1864. Journal, 64th Council, p. 2, June 11, 1866.

[3] The limited amount of sewers built prior to 1863, at which time the abundant supply of Potomac water became available instead of the flow from a small tributary of the river, was ordered by the city council and paid for from the ward funds, but a charge was made for their use.

Up to the middle of 1863 the entire local effort had been directed towards doing something about the streets. Then a broader note was struck. The council adopted a resolution, providing for a joint committee to prepare for submission to congress such amendments to the charter as would enable the city council, not alone to order a street to be paved, but to free street lighting and sewerage from a similar restriction, and in addition pay for the improvements out of the common fund.[1]

---

[1] Municipal Government, p. 254, John A. Fairlie. In the large cities of the United States, Professor Fairlie found that the cost of street paving is usually collected from the property owner. In some cases the city pays part of the expense, while in Boston the entire cost came from the common fund.

[2] Joint Resolution, July 19, 1862, and Feb. 28, 1863. A board of army officers recommended to the secretary of war that the government assist in cleaning two of the city streets — 7th and 14th streets. For a time the department had contrabands at work on these streets. *The Star*, May 16 and 28, 1863.

[3] Joint Resolution, Nov. 29, 1862.

[4] Ordinance, June 5, 1863.

The committee appointed was as follows: the mayor, Richard Wallach. From board of aldermen Charles H. Utermehle, Nathan Sargent and John B. Turton; common council: A. R. Shepherd, Crosby S. Noyes and George R. Ruff. At the ensuing session of congress, as stated above, the law of 1864 was enacted, which clothed the city council with the desired powers. It was this measure which James W. Grimes of Iowa, the chairman of the senate District committee, declared was what the city authorities desired.[2] Such a declaration is not inconsistent with a subsequent action by the city council, a short time before the bill became a law, in instructing a special committee to renew the effort to induce congress to contribute its share as a property holder to the common fund derived from taxation, from which the money was to be drawn to pay for the proposed improvements.[3] As throwing light upon the development of a man who, eight years later, devoted all the force of a masterful and resourceful nature to making real a high ideal he had of his native city as a worthy capital of a great nation, it is significant that Alexander R. Shepherd was the author of the resolution that resulted in the improvement law of 1864.[4] For, as he set forth in the preamble, improvements were needed, not alone because of the rapid growth of the population, but for the development of the city as the metropolis.[5] In advocating the adoption of the resolution by the common council, where he was serving his third and last year, although six years later he was elected to the board of aldermen, Mr. Shepherd said he wanted to free the municipality from its trammels, and remove from the city the stigma of the current descriptive phrase, "the city of mud and dust." [6]

---

[1] Journal, 63d Council, p. 25; also Joint Resolution, July 27, 1863.

[2] *Globe*, p. 982, March 8, 1864.

[3] Joint Resolution, April 25, 1864.

[4] Journal, 63d Council, p. 25.

[5] Joint Resolution, July 27, 1863.

[6] *National Republican*, June 30, 1863.

At that time Mr. Shepherd was twenty-eight years of age, an employing plumber, having begun as an apprentice when he was seventeen. Then his education, as far as schools went, came to an end.

At the session of congress following the one when the law of 1864 was passed, the departure from municipal methods sanctioned by it was corrected by amendatory legislation, enacted without discussion, and which shifted the cost of public improvements from the general revenues of the city back again to the abutting property. The council, however, retained the power of ordering the work to be done.[1] The change was in harmony with the practice current in municipalities of that day as well as with that of the general government as a District property holder, as it had, from the beginning, although irregularly, paid its share of improvements on streets where there was public property.[2]

It is quite evident the community was held responsible for the condition of the streets at the bar of public opinion, as represented by congress and visitors, and also that citizens were anxious, not only on that score, but also because of their interest as citizens, to bring about a change.[3] So that, however improvements were to be financed, the citizens wanted them. Of this there was no doubt. For hardly had the ink dried on the signature on the first measure, and the city council had the needed powers, when street paving and sewer ordinances began to be passed. Still more suggestive of this spirit were the provisions made for an increase in taxation, enlarging the city revenue, at its two principal sources, by raising the realty tax rate and also licenses for liquor and business places.[4] As an evidence of being thoroughly in earnest, the citizens could give no stronger proof. From a rate which was much less than that of any other city of its size in the country,[1] although, as was declared, the property holder shrinks from taxation,[2] the advance made was 66 per cent.[3] Attention was given, at this time, to the assessment valuation of real estate made every five years. By 1869 the assessment had reached 75 per cent of the market value.[4] As there was no let-up in city improvement ordinances in the second year of the new system, although the cost of such work was charged against individual property, instead of the general fund, it is evident the council, composed of property owners, as well as those among their constituents had not the same aversion to, or perhaps lack of interest in, street-paving bills as they had displayed during the decade and a half when such work could be done only with their consent. It is apparent the city fathers were not reminded that property owners had votes in the same way that it was brought to their attention by the owners of geese and pigs, with the result that the ordinances forbidding these animals the freedom of the streets were in such a tangle that no one knew what the law was, and it could not be enforced.[5] Apparently that was the purpose, as the council did not dare to disturb what had come to be regarded by such a large number of their constituents as a vested interest. No change was made until the territorial government was established.

---

[1] Stats., 13, 434, Feb. 23, 1865.

[2] At this period, beginning with the act of April 7, 1866 (Stats., 14, 18) and continuing to that of July 15, 1870 (The same, 16, 32), congress reimbursed the city for sewer and paving costs in front of public property to the extent of $397,324.

[3] Journal, 63d Council, p. 23; also 64th Council, p. 2.

[4] Ordinances, Aug. 11 and Oct. 31, 1864. The per capita taxation was increased from $4.55 to $7.20.

"The infinite, abominable nuisance of cows, horses, sheep and goats running through the city," was urged by George F. Edmunds of Vermont (then recently a property holder, as he owned the residence, 1409 Massachusetts Avenue, where he lived), in the debate in the senate on the territorial bill as a reason for making one branch of the legislature federal, so as to protect "the national representatives and national citizens, who come here to attend to business, from being obliged to share the sidewalks and streets with animals that ought to be kept enclosed."[1] As an illustration of the attitude of the local authorities in this particular, he spoke of the recent action of the city council in practically abolishing the board of health, by taking away its powers, because it undertook to put an end to this nuisance.[2] Then the senator added, "The waggish story on the streets was — of course it had no foundation in fact—that the board of health had abolished the voters, and the council could not stand it." The work of city improvements, entered upon with so much spirit and sanguineness, came to an end in practically two years. This was not due to lack of public interest, but mainly to the cost of improving such broad thoroughfares. For although the share of the city for paving and sewers was only the proportion sufficient to pay for the sections at street crossings, yet, as Mayor Wallach informed the council, he had approved the improvement bills passed at the previous session "very reluctantly, and to prevent odium from resting on this office. You are aware that there is already provision made for improvements, which, if executed, will absorb the revenue of the corporation for the next year. Under these circumstances it can hardly be expected that the improvements just provided can be made, if at all, at least for a long time."[3] In fact for the period of seven years, from the date of the enlargement of the powers of the corporation to the close of that form of government, only a little more than half of the street paving work was done that was authorized by the council.[4] If such loose legislative methods, or rather lack of method, applied only to appropriations for public improvements, it might be set down as due to an overzealous public spirit. The school fund, however, was exceeded in the same fashion,[1] while such needs as bounties for soldiers, which, while not annual, called for large sums,[2] were provided from current funds instead of from loans, as was done in other communities.[3] But that was a course in a measure forced on the city, as congress did not respond to a request for authority to lay a special tax for such a purpose.[4] Of necessity, such practices led to the creation of debt, although the prohibition laid by congress on an increase in the funded debt by the city authorities, unless by a two-thirds vote of the people, was never lifted. There is no record that a loan proposition was ever submitted to the people. On the other hand, no heed was paid to the charter requirement for a sinking fund. In addition, the floating debt began to pile up, so that when the two-year period of greatest activity in public improvements came to an end, it had increased more than three times, and then was nearly 40 per cent of the funded debt.[5] As the council persisted in voting money without knowing that the city had it, and the annual appropriations exceeded the revenues, the mayor fell into the practice of apportioning the city revenues, so that really he had in large measure the legislative function of the power of the purse.

---

[1] Mayor's inaugural address. *National Republican*, June 13, 1864.

[2] 38th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 1, Dec. 5, 1864. Secretary of interior's report.

[3] The rate in 1863 less deduction for prompt payment was 60 cents, while the next year it was $1. The prompt payment rebate was reduced from 15 to 10 cents and then to 5 and finally, in 1869, in place of a rebate the penalty device for tardiness was adopted.

[4] Journal, 67th Council, p. 180, July 26, 1869. The assessment value at the five-year periods was as follows: in 1859, $30,855,000; 1864, $45,000,000; and in 1869, $58,639,000.

[5] *The Star*, June 5, 1868.

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 687, Jan. 23, 1871.

[2] Ordinance, Jan. 21, 1871.

[3] Journal, 63d Council, p. 519, March 26, 1866.

[4] The number of squares authorized to be paved in this period were about 90, but only about 50 were paved. See Laws. Also Journals of the council, 64th Council, p. 72; 65th Council, p. 38; and 67th Council, p. 79. The street sections paved the first two years were as fol-

The limited and partial success of the city plan to secure

---

lows: F Street from 5th to 15th, 5th Street from D to G, 6th Street from Missouri Avenue to K, 4½ Street from city hall to the canal, and E Street from 13th to Pennsylvania Avenue.

[1] School trustees' report, 1867, p. 22.

[2] The entire amount paid by the city in bounties was $100,000. Journal, 63d Council, p. 189, Sept. 11, 1865.

[3] The same, 64th Council, p. 10.

[4] Joint Resolution, April 25, 1864.

[5] In 1862 the floating debt was $89,271 (*The Star*, May 2, 1862), while in 1866 it was $302,284. (Journal, 64th Council, p. 68.) As the funded debt, including $150,000 water stock authorized by congress, was $943,000, the aggregate debt in 1866 reached $1,245,284. During the preceding four years 41 per cent had been added to the debt, but owing to the growth in the population, the per capita debt had fallen from $14 in 1862 to $11 in 1866.

public improvements did not lead congress to conclude that any part of the burden of making the capital city a fit place fell upon the general government. For the national spirit had not then supplied the answer to the question, historic in District affairs, Why should the government be expected to defray purely municipal expenses? A large part of the members of congress had no doubt much the same feeling confessed to by David K. Cartter, chief justice of the District Supreme court. When he was a member of the house, as he did not understand why Washington should not meet its obligations like other cities, he voted against all District appropriations.[1] The time was not ripe for the government to assume a share of municipal expenses because of the federal character of the city, or even because of its large property holdings. Still, if congress at this time had taken the action it did in 1870,[2] and had given the city the right to reduce the width of the streets by means of parking, much more could have been done, as the cost would have been less. While this phase of street improvement was much discussed, both in and out of congress,[3] yet action was lacking.

In 1864, when congress had before it the problem of the city that had outgrown the clothes of childhood, there could be seen, some squares to the east of the capitol, the walls of a nearly finished structure, the largest and most complete ever erected in the District for school purposes, and with the exception of the city hall, the largest ever erected by the municipality. When the building was dedicated that summer, and given the name of the mayor of the city, in recognition of his interest in public schools, it not only represented a new departure in public school policy, but also in municipal finances. For the $45,000 expended was derived mainly from a special tax. Ever since 1860, when the city council first made use of the power conferred by the charter of 1848, the citizens had been paying a school tax of ten cents. Then five cents was added, two years later, which was doubled at the end of five years for a building fund, and with this assured income the board of school trustees, with the sanction of the city council, for the latter held the purse, turned their backs upon the small and plain buildings which had been in use up to this time, and decided upon doing what was being done in other cities, and erect in each of the four school districts a large building, capable of accommodating a number of schools. To spend nearly twice as much on one building as had been spent a year or two before for five buildings[1] aroused criticism. While it was claimed the interests of the schools required buildings where all the pupils of certain grades could assemble,[2] yet, after all, great stress was laid on the monumental character of such structures because they were "in accordance with the spirit of the age, and creditable to the capital of the nation." The erection of similar edifices, the trustees declared, "will do much to redeem us from the imputation so often made, that the city of Washington is a mere dependent upon government, and that it does nothing itself for the advancement of the welfare of its citizens."[3] Under this impulse, which was largely civic pride, the school trustees prepared, and the city council approved, plans for a second school building that at the outset was to cost nearly double what was spent on the Wallach. But when the Franklin School was completed five years later, the cost was more than four times as great. It is probable if during this time the plans could have been changed, or even if the building could have been sold, that members of the city council would have been glad to get rid of what proved a good deal of a white elephant. For during the four years of its building the entire schoolhouse fund was spent on it. All other school building stopped for that period. The leasing of buildings did not supply the demand, and so numbers of children were unable to attend school because of lack of room.[1] Yet satisfaction was expressed that in the Franklin the city had a school building that was superior to what was to be found in Boston, "whose pride and aristocracy of learning is so proverbial."[2] There is no question that the Franklin building, which is not as much admired to-day, either for its design or its plan, as it was in 1868, when it was completed, made an appeal to the public spirit and pride of Washington, that justified, to a large extent, in the minds of citizens, what was at the time recognized as an extravagance, in the current state of city finances, as well as an injustice to the children of Washington.[3]

---

[1] Journal, 63d Council, Appendix, p. 6.

[2] Stats., 16, 82.

[3] Journal, 63d Council, p. 23, Mayor's message, June 26, 1865. *The Star*, Feb. 5, 1867; *Globe*, p. 1698, March 1, 1867; the same, p. 2332, April 1, 1870.

---

[1] Journal, 64th Council, p. 146, Aug. 27, 1866.

[2] See discussion of this phase of school history by J. Ormond Wilson, at that time a school trustee and in 1870 appointed superintendent of the schools, succeeding Z. Richards, the first incumbent, who held the office about a year. In Eighty Years of the Public Schools, Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 1, p. 24.

[3] In Laws, 60th Council, Nov. 17, 1863. In the same strain Thomas E. Lloyd spoke, in the course of an address in taking his seat as president of the board of aldermen, in reference to the street improvements then in progress. Journal, 64th Council, p. 2, June 11, 1866.

No doubt school financing was affected by the expectation of aid from congress, which, however, was not realized, but which was kept alive by the revival, practically every year, of an effort to get congress to do for the District schools what was done in many states, — make a grant of public land.[4] The ambition of the citizens to have municipal buildings equal in appearance to those in other cities was not content with providing what were thought to be monumental school structures. In 1864, when the Franklin building was begun, the city authorities returned to the project interrupted by the war, and began the erection of a market building to take the place of the huddle of frame structures that defaced the main thoroughfare of the city. But hardly had the walls begun to appear above the surface of Centre Market square, when the work was stopped in a peremptory fashion by congress, because the two-year limit of time in the enabling act had expired, and the work had been begun without first getting the consent of that body.[1] This was the most promising chance the city ever had, or that it again had, for doing what was classed with school buildings and street and canal improvements as essential in making the city attractive. For congress had given authority to borrow enough money to erect the building, while the revenue of the market, even under existing conditions, was sufficient to carry the debt.

---

[1] The large school building policy was one of the issues in the mayoralty election in 1868. *National Republican*, May 16, 1868. Also Mayor Bowen's message. Journal, 66th Council, p. 23. Also common council school committee report. The same, 65th Council, p. 675.

[2] The same, 63d Council, p. 630, May 21, 1866. School committee report.

[3] The same, 65th Council, pp. 254 and 445. The same, 66th Council, pp. 232, 362, 450 and 474. The large school building policy was carried out, but on a more moderate scale than in the case of the Franklin. The Seaton was finished in 1871 and the Jefferson in 1872.

[4] Henry Wilson of Massachusetts said in the senate in 1866 that during the past seven or eight years he had offered such a bill nearly every year. *Globe*, p. 798, Feb. 7.

At this period, too, renewed attention was turned to that perennial subject, the improvement of the Washington canal, which had been used then for some years as the main city sewer, and was doing its part in making the city "one vast stench."[2] According to a report of a board of army engineers, made in 1866, the bottom of the canal, from 6th Street westward, was covered "with a mass of decaying animal and vegetable matter and earth, forming a soft, slimy and offensive compound, mostly bare a great portion of the time."[3] A year after the war the city spent a large sum in cleaning it out, as part of a plan to bring it into use as a commercial waterway, when the money could be obtained.[4] Finally, in 1870, these hopes seemed to be about to be realized, as congress granted the city authority to levy a tax, and also assumed one-third of the cost of the improvement.[5] But hardly had the restoration been begun, when the mayoralty form of government came to an end. The new government wisely arched the canal, but much to the regret and with the protests of many citizens, who still clung to the notion that it could be made commercially valuable.

The current practice in American cities of separating municipal expenses into two classes — one a charge on abutting property, and the other on the common fund derived mainly from a general real property tax — as adopted by congress for the district, placed such objects as street paving, lighting and sewers in the first class, and public schools, the police, the market house and the canal, in the second. In increasing, in 1864, the District's contribution to the cost of the police, congress continued its classification as a general expense. For when it was told by the secretary of the interior that he could not convince himself of the justice of the government paying, as he expressed it, the entire cost of police protection, and besides the town was prosperous and lightly taxed,[1] a clause was added to the section in an appropriation bill, providing for the expenses of the Metropolitan police, which placed upon the two District towns, and the county of Washington, about one-third of the amount appropriated. This action, while apparently the result of a sudden impulse, was well enough considered to provide the means for raising the money, as authority was given to levy a special tax, which was done.[2] The same care in providing a source of revenue was not shown, when the direct tax was laid in 1861. This was not done by a separate measure, as was the case with a similar tax of half a century before, but the District was included in a list of the states and territories subject to the tax. While this law provided federal collectors, yet the states found it much cheaper to use their own tax collecting machinery, and as they had the power, that was done. But the District was obliged to go to congress for authority, and it was three years before it was obtained.[3] The practice of providing for certain municipal needs by special taxes was no more distinctive for the District than the classification of municipal expenses was consistent or permanent. For in 1868, some four years after congress had classified lighting as a charge on the abutting property, it was shifted to the general class.[4]

---

[1] 38th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 5, Dec. 7, 1864.

[2] *The Star*, Aug. 8, 1863.

[3] Journal, 63d Council, p. 547, March 31, 1866.

[4] Ordinance, April 17, 1866.

[5] Stats., 16, 309, July 15, 1870.

---

[1] 38th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 1, Dec. 5, 1863.

[2] Stats., 13, 159, June 25, 1864.

[3] *Congressional Globe*, p. 3130, Jan. 21, 1864.

[4] Stats., 15, 261, July 27, 1868.

This was not done as the result of any study of municipal taxation, but mainly in the first instance because the city had failed, as congress had directed, to enlarge its share of the city lighting, that up to that time was about one-half.[1] As a consequence came the enactment, two years later, that placed the entire cost on the city, a penalty for an attempt to shirk what congress had required. To provide the means, a special tax was directed to be imposed.[2] In case the city failed to impose the tax, then the secretary of the interior was directed to do it, and use the proceeds in lighting the city. In 1868 such a method of enforcing compliance with the will of congress was not unknown in District legislation, although it had never been resorted to prior to 1861. In that year occurred the first instance, for then congress provided, in case the towns did not, as required by the act establishing the Metropolitan police, furnish police station-houses and light and heat them, then the board was directed to supply these needs, and the cost "shall become a proper charge against the said towns." Five years later, when the District was required to pay half the cost of a proposed new jail building, the secretary of the interior was directed, in the event of a default, to collect the money by a

---

[1] Stats., 14, 315, July 28, 1866. Journal, 64th Council, p. 656.

[2] By the expedient of the special tax the levy was raised from 75 cents in 1863, just prior to the era of improvements, to $1.80 in 1870 when the mayoralty form of government drew to its close. How this levy was made up is shown by the following table:—

	1863	1864	1870
General	60	70	75
Schools	10	15	50
Schoolhouses	5	5	
Police		10	15
Direct tax		10	
Lighting			12
Sinking fund			10
Washington canal			18
Total	75	110	180
Less rebate	15	10	
	$.60	$1.00	$1.80

tax levy on property.[1] When, owing to differences about the location and the kind of building, actual construction was not begun for six years, still in a new law the same conditions were imposed on the territorial government that had then succeeded the mayoralty government.[2] A similar precaution was adopted to insure the District's contribution to the establishment of a House of Correction, subsequently the Reform School for Boys, and now the National Training School.[3] At the same session the prison and reform school measures became laws, congress directed that in case the District towns did not pay to the trustees of the colored schools the proportion of the school fund, as provided by the law of 1864, the unpaid instalments would not only be subject to an interest charge of 10 per cent, but the trustees were authorized to bring suit for debt in the supreme court of the District.[4]

It may be said of this class of laws, that while congress, by a subsequent enactment, called on the District for a much larger contribution to the support of the police than the requirement of the law of 1861, yet no penalty was provided to insure compliance. Nor, indeed, was it necessary. In the lack of contemporary explanation, it may be conjectured that the unusual precaution adopted in the case of the jail and reform school measures was due in part, at least, to their novelty, as they represented the first instance of the coöperation of congress and the District in providing buildings for District needs. As the event proved, the District's share in the new buildings was paid, without compulsion, just as was the case with the charges for the police and street lighting. But it was quite different with the colored-school money, as was the case with every subject of that period which touched the negro question. Three years passed before the corporation of Washington met in full the requirements of the law to pay to the trustees of the colored schools a proportionate share of the school fund. Then compliance was secured only after congress, by the law of 1866, rejected the mayor's construction of the law of 1864, by which the intended share was cut in half, and the trustees had made use of the penalizing clause, and had secured a decision from the District supreme court, which gave them the arrearages.[1]

---

[1] Stats., 14, 231, July 25, 1866. [2] The same, 17, 21, June 1, 1872.

[3] This institution was opened in 1870 after eight years of fruitless effort. The citizens undertook in 1862 to put an end to the primitive system of a common jail for offenders, old and young alike, by securing an incorporation for the Guardian Society, but the voluntary subscriptions of citizens on which the society depended were not adequate. Three years later the congressional plan to make use of state institutions failed. Finally success came when the general and local governments coöperated.

[4] Stats., 14, 216, July 23, 1866.

Mingled politics and humanitarianism made the race issue more intense as slavery became more remote. This is clearly reflected in District legislation. At the first regular session of congress after the inauguration of Lincoln, slavery was abolished in the District, and in addition, with the exception of jury duty, civil rights, to the extent of making the colored subject to the same laws as the whites, were bestowed on the colored people.[2]

As Charles Sumner declared in the senate, the District emancipation law went to "the root of all this noisome humanity,"[3] while the civil rights section of the colored school law cut away the great mass of class legislation known as the Black Code, which the northern people regarded as the abuses of slavery, and the southern people, as its necessary condition. The free colored — a section of the population nearly four times larger than that of the slaves — were released from the restrictions and espionage of the hateful ten o'clock law and other similar regulations, and besides were made subject to the same laws as the whites.

Thus was taken the first step in making a part of the Nation a class that was then, to a large extent, even in the free states, without civil and political rights. A suggestion of what proved to be the final stage is to be found in the debate on the emancipation bill. When it was proposed to submit the question of emancipation to a vote of the citizens, it was declared that the vote ought not to be confined to the free whites, but to all over twenty-one years of age.[1] While at this period congress passed an act prohibiting slavery in the territories, a measure of no immediate local effect, owing to the lack of a colored population, six years passed before what was done in the District had a national application through the slavery and civil rights amendments to the constitution.

---

[1] *The Star*, Nov. 12, 1867. Journal, 64th Council, p. 377; The same, 65th Council, p. 417.

[2] Stats., 12, 378, 407, April 16 and May 21, 1862. A section in the law of July 12, 1862 (Stats., 12, 539) forbade the exclusion of witnesses on account of color.

[3] *Globe*, p. 12, Dec. 4, 1861.

District emancipation had its opponents among the citizens, but such opposition was confined to details, and not to the principle. For it was realized that the institution was doomed, a result, it was declared, which few of the people regret.[2] The point of real difference was, whether it should be immediate or gradual. It was not feared that the District slaves, if given their freedom, would abuse their liberty and create disorder, as was felt in other parts of the country when the general emancipation proclamation was issued eight months later, at the opening of the year 1863. However, the fear as to what the black man would do, if set free, did not affect public opinion as strongly as the state of mind later on, as to what the white man would do if the colored man was not given the protection of the ballot.

Unlike the states in arms against the government, where alone the slaves were declared free by the general emancipation proclamation, there were but few slaves in the District — only four per cent of the entire population. No doubt such a condition had something to do with the course of congress in not granting time for the adjustment of the community to the new relations, as was done in the offer made at this juncture to coöperate with any state emancipating its slaves, which was an appeal to the border states, where the proportion of slaves was very much larger than in the District.

At the same time, in making emancipation in the District immediate instead of gradual, congress went counter to the judgment of citizens who, while not clinging to the old order, had naturally not gotten rid of the current notion in slave communities of the negro, especially the free class, as a peril to society. So citizens protested that if the District was made at once free soil, surrounded as it was by slave territory, it would become an asylum for free negroes, "a class not desirable in any excess above the wants of society." [1] This feeling in communities where there was any considerable negro population Lincoln expressed at this time, when he said to a delegation of colored men, "There is an unwillingness on the part of our people, harsh as it may seem, for you free colored people to remain with us." [2] Because of the comparatively small number of slaves in Maryland, the objection based on slave surroundings was not greatly lessened when, in less than two years after District emancipation, slavery was done away with in that state by a state constitutional provision. The *Intelligencer,* representing in large part the sentiment of a community thus forced to experience what was looked upon with doubt and apprehension, shivered in anticipation of the icy plunge.[3] Just as characteristic of the attitude on such questions of the controlling element of the Republican party, and of the new element in Washington, was the declaration of the *National Republican,* that the emancipation measure would mark "the commencement of a new epoch of prosperity for the city. Washington only needs free principles and free industry which have built up the great cities of the north." [4] After the emancipation bill became a law, the *Sunday Morning Chronicle,* a strenuous upholder of the Republican party and all its measures, pointed out, apparently for the benefit of those who had been fearful, "The emancipation act has created very little more sensation among the population of Washington than any of the ordinary measures of legislation." [5] However, the passage of the act was significant and important. It brought to a close an issue about which the antislavery conflict had raged for years, as well as placed on the statute books the preliminary measure of what proved to be a national policy that was not merely to strike the chains from the slaves, but raise them to civil and political equality.[1] Congress at this time attempted to purge the District from disloyalty. "It is notorious," declared Charles Sumner, the leader of the radical Republicans in the senate, the day after the District emancipation bill was signed, "that we have about us a very disloyal people, that there is here a very disloyal population." [2] Yet with the severe scrutiny directed by the law when the commission appointed to pay for District-owned slaves completed its work of disbursing nearly one million dollars, it stated that as to the question of loyalty, "There are but few instances in which the evidence was of a nature to warrant the commission in withholding compensation." [3] When congress made provision for confiscating the property of disloyal persons in the District, only forty-four such persons were found,[4] although prior to the passage of that law the *National Republican* asserted that there is "a vast amount of property of rebels in the city; any other government than that of the United States would have confiscated it long ago." [5] Local political ambition was no doubt a motive in securing the passage of a measure by congress, which required, during the continuance of the war, all electors at a city election, when challenged on the ground of disloyalty, to take the iron-bound oath of allegiance as a condition of voting.[6] A couple of weeks later, when the mayoralty election was held, Richard Wallach was reëlected mayor by a vote of five to one. The total vote, however, was one-fourth less than that at the election two years before, which was attributed by the *Intelligencer* to lack of interest in the election, the result of which was apparently a foregone conclusion. On the other hand, the *Republican* claimed that the smallness of the vote was due to the test oath.[7]

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 1478, April 1, 1862.

[2] *Intelligencer*, April 12, 1862; also *Globe*, p. 1475, April 1, 1862.

---

[1] *Intelligencer,* March 27, 1862. Joint Resolution of City Council, April 5, 1862.

[2] McPherson's Rebellion, p. 374, Aug. 14, 1862.

[3] April 3, 1862. [4] Feb. 15, 1862. [5] April 10, 1862.

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 1338, March 24, 1862.

[2] The same, p. 1689, April 17, 1862.

[3] 38th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 42, p. 8, Feb. 17, 1864.

[4] District Court Docket, No. 1, April 21, 1863.

[5] Jan. 6, 1862.

[6] Stats., 12, 403, May 20, 1862.

[7] *Intelligencer* and *Republican*, June 3, 1862.

But several months before this test oath was applied to voters the city council directed that an oath of allegiance be required of the officers and employés of the corporation.[1] In addition to thus entering into competition with congress, in safe-guarding the interests of the union as well as offering no opposition to measures that made radical changes in the relations of the two races, the District at this time had two regiments of soldiers in the service,[2] while provision was made from the city treasury to aid in the support of families of those in the army.[3]

But the cycle of negro legislation would be incomplete, according to current sentiment in the dominant party in congress, while the courts remained unchanged. In fact, the first approach by congress to the colored question in the District was from this angle. For it was found in the winter of 1861–1862 that at the Nation's capital people were not only liable, but actually were thrown into jail, because, under existing laws, the color of their skins exposed them to the suspicion of being slaves.[4] While such instances of the abuse of the Black Code were laid at the door of the circuit court, they were in fact mainly due to the ancient but vicious system, that made the living of magistrates and constables dependent upon fees.[5] It is apparent, from this first discussion of the negro question, when the District emancipation measure was up, as well as from much that was said in the debate on the court bill itself, a year later, that Senator Fessenden of Maine, a Republican, but not a radical, expressed a view which was quite generally held in both houses, when he said that he had not felt "particularly pleased at any time with the conduct of matters here [in the District] and with the feeling prevailing among the people of the District with regard to the class of opinions with which I am somewhat connected."[1] Besides a feeling of distrust in what was apparently the Republican party soundness of the people, equivalent in much of the thought of that day to disloyalty, it was suspected that the court, as then constituted, was not to be wholly depended upon. So the circuit court was abolished, and the supreme court of the District was established, a judicial system taken from that in one of the counties in New York state. From the standpoint of the political opponents of the dominant party this change was mainly a question of patronage, a purging of the court from democracy.[2]

---

[1] Ordinance, Jan. 6, 1862.

[2] *National Republican*, Feb. 6 and 19, 1862.

[3] Journal, 63d Council, p. 189, Sept. 11, 1865.

[4] Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts, the author of the District emancipation bill, said in the course of the debate on that measure (*Globe*, p. 1351), that colored men coming from the free states with regiments had been arrested as runaways. Also reference in the *National Republican* of Feb. 24 and 28, 1862, of arrests of suspected slaves.

[5] *Globe*, p. 11, Dec. 4, 1861. A clause in the court bill, which was greatly expanded by the law of Feb. 22, 1867 (Stats., 14, 401), placed the justices of the peace as well as the regulation of their fees under the control of the new court.

David K. Cartter of Ohio, who was made chief justice, had been appointed by President Lincoln, in 1861, as minister to Bolivia. Two associate justices, Abraham B. Olin of New York and George P. Fisher of Delaware, were members of the congress[3] that enacted the law, but had not been reëlected. The fourth member, Andrew Wylie, had been practising law in the District for fifteen years. Upon the death of Thomas H. Crawford, judge of the criminal court, a few weeks before the court bill became a law, President Lincoln nominated him to fill the vacancy. Owing to the pending legislation which, when enacted, did away with the criminal court, the nomination was not acted upon, and his name was sent to the senate as judge of the new court. That the court bill was regarded as partisan legislation is shown by the opposition of Henry May,—a member of the house, from Maryland, and a former member of the District bar, who had for years been trying to induce congress to abolish the old court,[1] — as well as by that of practically the entire bar.[2] The feeling was strong enough among the lawyers to lead two of the most prominent, James M. Carlisle and William J. Stone, to refuse to be admitted to practice before the new court.[3] The only concession to local opinion in the entire law was leaving the Orphan's Court untouched, and it was not until 1870 that this court became a part of the general system.[4] While an entire change was made in the existing judicial system and practice, yet the new court retained the same powers and jurisdiction as the circuit court. After it had been in existence for nearly a third of a century, one of its members, in the course of a public address, said of the act by which the court was established that "considering the haste with which it was prepared, and the obscurity of its verbiage, it is no wonder that we have been many years in settling its meaning."[5] A year was to pass before another vestige of slavery in the District was done away with, by the repeal of the fugitive slave law, by the act of June 28, 1864. But before that was done, the new court, at the very outset of its career, emerged with credit from a test, not unknown in that period, of strong public feeling, when it was asked practically to set aside the fugitive slave law because it was contrary to current opinion. The sturdy common sense of David K. Cartter, the chief justice, that marked his career on the bench, pointed out to him the substantial justice of the cause, when he declared that as long as it was a law, it must be enforced. While but one of his associates stood with him in this decision, he not only refused to release the slave brought before him, on a writ of habeas corpus, but Walter S. Cox, who had been appointed by the circuit court as commissioner under the fugitive slave law, was reappointed by the new court.[1] While the court upheld the right of the loyal owner to his slave, as the law required, public sentiment did not. An excited crowd about the court insisted that the slave be restored to liberty instead of to his owner. The police interfered, and taking the boy in custody to avoid a riot, turned him over to the provost guard, where he was beyond the pale of the law and consequently out of the reach of the owner.[2] As one of the incidental results of the cleaning out of the District stables of the slavery system, which occupied so much of the time of congress at this period, the jail and its management became the subject of complaint and then of legislation. The humane feelings of congressional visitors were stirred at the sight of so many victims of slave laws and their miserable plight. But their sense of official dignity was aroused by the action of the marshal, Ward H. Lamon, a personal appointment of President Lincoln, who issued new rules regulating the admission of visitors, which did not exempt members of congress. Then the marshal was investigated. That officer, it was found, was getting, in the way of fees and emoluments, twice the salary paid to United States marshals elsewhere. Included in the perquisites of the office was the profit on the allowance made for feeding the prisoners. Then congress created the office of jail warden, and placed a limit on the amount the marshal should receive. At the same time the fee compensation of the clerk of the court and the district attorney was changed to fixed annual allowances.[3] No change was made in the compensation for recording deeds, although at that time the duties were separated from those of the clerk of the court, and a new office created, known as the Register, then subsequently as Recorder of Deeds.[1] While reorganizing the instruments of the law, as well as wiping out the accumulated mass of class legislation relating to the colored people, congress made no less than three provisions for the preparation of a code, but with the exception of a work prepared by Return J. Meigs,[2] not even that stage in the undertaking was reached.[3] There is no doubt that the District emancipation law had an influence in the great movement of the colored people, as they sought to escape from slave to free soil, just as the emancipation proclamation, issued eight months later, had and was designed to have. Both measures gave an impetus to what had started as soon as the war began. In the course of a few months after Sumter was fired on, the flow of escaping slaves to the District had increased to such an extent as to engage the attention of the common council.[4] As the confederates fell back to the south side of the Rappahannock, in the spring of 1862, and the union troops advanced from Washington to Manassas, a wider area of country was exposed from which the slaves could pass to the union lines. The result was seen in the increase in the number of contrabands coming to the District.[5] The movement reached such proportions, while the debate on District emancipation was still going on, that a Freedmen's Aid Association was organized in the city, with Hannibal Hamlin, the vice-president of the United States, at its head, "to furnish assistance and protection

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 12, Dec. 4, 1861.

[2] The same, pp. 1049 and 1128, Feb. 18, 1863.

[3] In 1870 Judge Fisher resigned and was appointed district attorney, serving until 1875, when he was succeeded by Henry H. Wells. By the law of Jan. 21, 1870, congress provided an additional judge, so that two new members were added to the court that year, namely, David C. Humphreys of Alabama and Arthur MacArthur of Wisconsin.

---

[1] Reminiscences of the Court of the District, Walter S. Cox, Washington Law Reporter, p. 501, Aug. 8, 1894.

[2] *Congressional Globe*, 37th Cong., 3d Sess., p. 1135, Feb. 18, 1863. Memorial signed by forty-eight members of the bar.

[3] Address of Walter S. Cox, Washington Law Reporter, March 26, 1896.

[4] Stats., 16, 161, June 21, 1870. William F. Purcell, who was appointed judge of the court in 1848, continued in that capacity until the court was abolished. The register of wills under the old Maryland system was a part of the court. The incumbent, Edward N. Roach, had served twenty-five years when in October, 1861, Moses Kelly was appointed in his place. As the nomination was not confirmed, Zenas C. Robbins was appointed Aug. 7, 1862.

[5] Address of Walter S. Cox, Washington Law Reporter, p. 502, Aug. 8, 1895.

---

[1] *The Star*, May 17 and 18, 1862; *Baltimore Sun*, May 26 and June 11, 1863.

[2] *The Star*, May 11 and 22, 1863.

[3] *Congressional Globe*, p. 728, Feb. 18, 1864.

---

[1] Stats., 12, 651, Feb. 14, 1863. Nathaniel C. Towle, the first to hold the office, was confirmed by the senate, March 13, 1863. His successors were Richard M. Hall, confirmed June 26, 1866; Edward C. Eddie, confirmed March 2, 1867; James R. Roche, appointed on death of Eddie, was rejected by the senate, July 25, 1868; Fletcher P. Cuppy, confirmed July 27, 1868; Simon Wolf, confirmed Aug. 21, 1869; George A. Sheridan, confirmed May 21, 1878.

[2] Mr. Meigs was appointed clerk of the new court. He selected as his deputy, E. J. Middleton, who had been for years in the clerk's office of the old court.

[3] Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 3, p. 125.

[4] *The Star*, Dec. 10, 1861.

[5] The same, March 22, 1862. By the spring of 1863 it was estimated that 10,000 had come (The same, April 11, 1863), which was within 4000 of the entire colored population in 1860.

to the large number of contrabands who are flying to Washington for refuge."[1] Nearly a year before, a similar movement had begun, with Fortress Monroe as its objective, and there General B. F. Butler, in command of the union forces, had received the fleeing slaves as contraband, fed, clothed, and put them to work. Yet no use was made in the discussion in congress of either of these instances, so close at hand, to illustrate the probable effect of emancipation, or to confirm or refute the contention, so frequent in such discussions, of the danger and undesirability of adding to the numbers of the colored population. As compared with the significance of action by congress on this subject, it was a matter of little concern, as far as the District emancipation bill went, what the local effect might be, or what the wishes of the people were. For it was the national effect that was chiefly aimed at, although the measure was entirely local in its scope. As was declared more than once during the debate, emancipation was an experiment, and the District was a good place to make the test.[2] Whatever the motive for granting to the District in this measure less than what was offered at this time to the states, the discrimination began and ended with making emancipation immediate instead of gradual. For money was voted to pay the loyal owners of slaves set free under the act, and also for the expenses of sending out of the country all the colored who would consent to go. The same terms of compensation and colonization were offered to any state emancipating its slaves. President Lincoln, who favored colonization, as he had done when he was a member of the house in 1848, soon discovered that it was no more acceptable to the colored people at this time than it had been during the half century since the American Colonization Society entered upon its work.

As they would not go away, what was to be done with them? That question had been asked many times before. Now it must be answered. As the colored people wandered into the city, and for the most part across the bridges spanning the

---

[1] *The Star*, March 22, 1862.

[2] *Globe*, pp. 1267 and 1491, March 18, 1862.

Potomac, singly and in groups, the government, to the extent the colored people were willing, assumed the responsibility for their care in much the same fashion as was being done at military posts in Virginia by General Butler and in South Carolina by General W. T. Sherman. Shelter and food were provided, and for the able bodied, work in the government corrals and about the hospitals, while private benevolence, mainly from northern sources, sent teachers who opened schools.[1] It was purely discretionary with the strangers whether they accepted the aid of the government. Although in the mass ignorant and poor, they had notions of what this great change meant for them. To some it meant freedom from work, while to others it meant larger opportunities for themselves and their children. Whatever the motive, the vast majority preferred to take their chances in the city rather than to go to the contraband camp.[2] In this way, such a settlement as Murder Bay, between 13th and 15th streets, Ohio Avenue, and the canal, or B Street, came into existence, a vile place, both physically and morally, where decent living was impossible. In contrast was Fredericksburg, in the southern section, an orderly and industrious community, as was the case, but not to the same extent, with other settlements of the refugees throughout the city.[3] As the war ended, the soldiers went away, the hospitals were closed and the flush times came to an end, Washington was left with an excess population of the labor class. The change was specially felt by the colored people. An attempt was made by the Freedmen's Bureau to relieve the situation, by sending them to parts of the country where their labor was needed. But although transportation and rations for the journey were offered, yet it was found there was "reluctance on the part of the majority to leave their miserable houses and start forth to parts of the country new and strange to them."[1] The condition was so urgent, that both the city and the federal government, for the first time, made regular annual appropriations for poor relief.[2]

---

[1] At first the contrabands were housed in the dwellings known as Duff Green's Row on 1st Street between East Capitol and A streets. (*The Star*, May 30, 1862.) Then army barracks at Vermont Avenue and 12th Street were occupied. (The same, July 16, 1862.) The next spring the final change was made to the bottom-land of the Arlington estate. (The same, May 22, 1863.)

[2] The estimated contraband population in the city in 1863 (The same, April 11) was 10,000, while at Arlington there were 1000. (The same, Dec. 4.)

[3] Report of A. C. Richards, superintendent of police, giving an account of an inspection of colored sections. (*Globe*, p. 1507, March 19, 1866.) The impression of wretchedness which this description gives was not due to the style of the author, as is sometimes the case with modern Washington alley literature, for he was a police official and not a magazine writer.

What was done by congress in the District in the spring of 1862, in relation to the colored people, was something more than furnishing an object-lesson in emancipation and civil rights to the nation, although, of course, that was an essential purpose. It was a consistent development along lines tending to make a separate and distinct class a part of the body politic. The next move was in the opposite direction. That was done when congress attempted to provide public schools, not alone for the contrabands, but for the entire colored population. For among the evils of the slavery system was the closing of the doors of the public schools of the District to colored children, even to those who had taxpaying parents.[3] So congress designed, by its law of 1862, to have in the county where there was no public provision for education white schools supported by a tax on the property of the whites and colored schools supported by a tax on the property of the colored. In the two towns colored schools were to be opened and supported by a similar use of the school-tax fund.[1] The effect of this legislation, as well as of the act passed at this time, reorganizing the jury system, in which the word "white" was used throughout,[2] made the change in these relations of the two races gradual, a principle that was disregarded in the emancipation measure.

---

[1] Freedmen's Bureau report, Nov. 14, 1866; 39th Cong., 2d Sess., House Doc. No. 1, p. 727. The following year a census taken under the direction of the commissioner of education by the police showed a total colored population of 38,663 or 30 per cent of the entire District population. In 1860 the percentage of colored to white was 19.

[2] For the most part the city's money was spent for fuel distributed by the police, while the federal government used the Freedmen's Bureau and various benevolent societies as the distributors of fuel, food and clothing. From 1866 to 1871 the congressional appropriations aggregated $127,000.

[3] This injustice to colored taxpayers was recognized to a limited extent five years before the opening of the war in a law enacted by congress, which, however, was not carried out, providing white public schools in Washington County, which excepted from the school tax the property of colored people. (Stats., 11, 36.) As has been noted, it was also made an issue by a small minority in the mayoralty contest of 1850.

It is quite evident that congress, in this school legislation, while undoubtedly influenced, was not so entirely carried away by the zeal of advocates of the negro, who were apt to be honest though mistaken, to depend too much on the assertion that "the free colored men of the District possess hundreds of thousands of dollars of property," [3] and that their contribution to the tax fund was therefore large. For the colored school trustees were also authorized to make use of "contributions of persons disposed to aid in the education of the colored people." The expectation based on the property holdings of the colored [4] was as disappointing [5] as were those on the coöperation of philanthropy. For while money continued to be contributed in astonishing volume, by religious and educational organizations and individuals in the north, and many schools were carried on, the funds were not placed in the hands of the school trustees.[6] So of the colored public school system, which congress planned, all that came from it in the first two years was one colored school opened in a church building.[1]

---

[1] Stats., 12, 394 and 407.

[2] The same, 12, 427, June 10, 1862.

[3] *Globe*, pp. 1191 and 1854, March 12, 1867.

[4] In 1862–1863 the school tax of 10 per cent of the taxes paid by the colored people realized $346 and the next year $396, which was about two per cent of the sum derived during these years from the same percentage of the taxes paid by the whites. Journal, 63d Council, p. 188; the same, 64th Council, p. 327.

[5] Exaggerated claims continued to be made. In December, 1865, when the negro suffrage bill was pending, a petition was presented to the senate signed by 2500 colored residents of Washington, claiming to be taxpayers, whereas, it was asserted, the tax books showed the names of only 573 colored property owners. Journal, 63d Council, p. 380; the same, 64th Council, p. 720.

[6] Special report of commissioner of education, 1871, p. 223. After a revenue was really provided for the schools, as was done by the law

At the next long session, congress discarded both philanthropy and enthusiasm as a financial basis for a school system, and returned to its original policy, and treated the colored people as a part of the community by directing that they should receive a proportionate part of the school fund. But in this particular District legislation, for the first time, in the movement to adjust the relations of the two races, was not in the lead. For a few months earlier the constitutional convention of Louisiana, held with the consent of President Lincoln, provided in the constitution, which was adopted by the people but not accepted by congress, public schools equally for the benefit of white and colored.[2] The District school law of 1864, passed by congress, was so carelessly written that the vital money clause was susceptible of two meanings. The mayor of the city, by his reading, cut in half the twenty per cent of the school fund, which the school trustees held was the proportion, according to the census of 1860, due the colored schools. Even then the mayor was so far away from the thought that the colored population formed any part of the community, that he maintained this smaller sum was much too large, because it was so much greater than the proportion of the colored people's contribution to the tax fund.[3] Why congress changed, by the law of 1864, what the mayor termed "the equitable provision" of the law of 1862 was, as he maintained later on, because of "the necessity for making provision for a new and powerful element of a political party."[4] However, the year before this statement was made,

---

of 1864, then agencies began to coöperate with the school trustees, as did also the Freedmen's Bureau when it was established in 1865. Shortly after 1867 outside help was withdrawn. The same, p. 254.

[1] The first colored public school in the District was started in the Ebenezer Church on 4th Street near Virginia Avenue on the 1st of March, 1864.

[2] Lincoln's Complete Works, Vol. 2, p. 672.

[3] Journal, 63d Council, p. 188. The special census of 1867 made the colored school proportion one-third instead of one-fifth.

[4] Mayor's message, June 24, 1867. In Journal, 65th Council, p. 29.

and when the negro franchise measure was pending in congress, the mayor, in discussing it, touched only upon the phase of the unfairness "to saddle this community with the expense of educating the thousands of colored persons forced on us by the general government."[1] While the mayor accused congress of playing politics, congress branded the mayor in his representative capacity as a person not to be trusted. For in the law of July 23, 1866, besides setting aside the mayor's construction of the law of 1864, in favor of the interpretation given by the school trustees, congress showed distrust by authorizing the trustees to take the mayor into court if he failed to pay any part of the money directed to be paid by the law of 1864. Congress and the city authorities had never before been in such open antagonism. No doubt the feeling was intensified by the bitterness of the contest between the president and congress over the reconstruction policy. More especially as the congressional plan which was finally put into effect included an initial test of negro suffrage in the District. The school fund controversy left its mark on District relations with congress, as all outbursts of passion make their impress. The school law of 1864 treated the colored population as a part of the community, just as the Louisiana constitution proposed to do. However, it was not claimed for Louisiana, as was the case for the District, that the great bulk of the colored population was a foreign element, distinct from community interests. According to current ideas, that was also the relation of the government employés, then a larger element in the population than ever before. As they were not the owners of property, and in consequence paid nothing directly into the treasury, any more than the bulk of the colored people, it was argued that it was unfair to expect the District to provide public schools for those classes.[2] While congress created no public land fund for education in the District, it did, in 1866, make its first direct money appropriation to that cause by directing that $10,000 be used in providing buildings for colored schools in Washington County, the only section of the population by that time still unprovided with school facilities.[1] Two years later, a similar appropriation was made, which brought to a close this class of legislation. In fact, however, in 1864, congress had actually created a school fund for the entire District by setting aside the fines and forfeitures imposed for violation of United States laws in the District. But the fund was small, so small that in the case of the colored schools of the county congress made the direct appropriations referred to.

---

[1] Journal, 64th Council, p. 71.

[2] The same, 63d Council, Appendix, p. 5; the same, 66th Council, p. 22, June 29, 1868.

---

[1] Special report of commissioner of education, 1871, p. 268.

CHAPTER XVIII

STRUGGLE OVER EQUAL RIGHTS

While the legislation of 1862, in addition to doing away with slavery in the District, made the colored people equal with the white before the law, yet when a specific case arose of denial of their rights, as was the case in the division of the school fund, instead of appealing to the courts a special law was obtained from congress. This was the course adopted to secure equal rights on the street-cars.[1] Their use was as strictly confined to the white race as had been the custom with the old-time omnibus line which the cars replaced. There were, however, exceptions. Colored women had been allowed to ride in an omnibus, provided in each case she "had somebody's white baby on her lap," [2] while colored people could use the cars if they did not venture beyond the platform. The change in current conditions, now that the colored people were more numerous and besides had money to spend, was recognized, as the company paralleled its Pennsylvania Avenue car line by a line of busses for their use. But it proved to be a failure, not so much because the discrimination was resented, as that the street-car platform was preferable to the discomfort of a bus ride over the corrugated surface of Pennsylvania Avenue.[3] However, the company made another effort to provide for this growing traffic, and adopted what came to be known in later years as the Jim Crow car, following in this respect the practice of the steam railroads as well as that of the Philadelphia street-car companies.[4] Before the end of the first year of railway operation, signs were placed on some of the cars, stating "colored persons admitted in this car." They were not removed until a few weeks before the close of the war, and then not because of any court decision, as there is no record that any legal action was taken, but because, by special act, congress forbade exclusion from the cars on account of color.[1] Nearly two years before, in 1863, such a provision had been inserted in the charter granted to the Alexandria and Washington Railway Co. to build a bridge over the Potomac and to operate horse-drawn cars to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad depot, and then a little later in the charter creating the Metropolitan Street Railway, so that when the restriction was applied to the Pennsylvania Avenue line, the entire street-car service of the city was freed from color discrimination, only, however, as the result of direct legislation. However, if a colored person boarded a steam car for the north, he was obliged to sit in the smoking car, as was the case when he went south; but such discrimination came to an end after the adoption of the civil rights act of 1866, followed by appeals to the courts.[2] It may be concluded that the period of immunity enjoyed by the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Co. was due neither to the influence of the passes, that were apparently generally issued to the members of congress,[3] nor to lack of opportunity on the part of congress; for at this time an extension of the company's chartered rights was granted by that body. It is quite evident that neither congress nor the company, although both were controlled by northern men, was quite ready to give practical effect to such a detail of race equality. Public opinion lagged behind the eager zeal of the radical element. When it was first proposed by the Washington and Georgetown Co. to use Jim Crow cars, Salmon P. Chase, the secretary of the treasury and a stockholder, wrote in fruitless protest to his friend, Jay Cooke, the dominant figure in the railroad enterprise. "Why cannot colored people ride on the cars?" he asked. "Their exclusion is a disgrace. If such cars [referring to the proposed colored specials] are poorer than the others, as a stockholder I protest. But have no such cars."[1] It was proposed at this time in the senate to prohibit this discrimination, and in advocating the measure, which failed to receive final action, Henry Wilson of Massachusetts said that in riding to the capitol in a street-car he saw on the front platform "five colored Methodist clergymen dressed like gentlemen and behaving like gentlemen, while inside were two drunken loafers."[2] Some of the colored people felt the injustice of a discrimination based solely upon color, but what action was taken was purely individual, as when some of them refused to use the cars while forbidden to go inside.[3] A few months after separate street-cars were in use Senator Saulsbury of Delaware declared in the senate that the people of the District had not asked to have them done way with. "But some black fellow," he added, "who thought himself clothed in a little brief authority and wore a surgeon's insignia, presumed to intrude himself into a car and was turned out. On this single case stands the appeal to the senate."[4] In fact the sentiment in the community was so strong, even after congress had forbidden this species of discrimination, that separate cars were continued in use. The Washington and Georgetown Co. yielded only after Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts notified it of his purpose to move the forfeiture of the charter and further made a formal complaint to the District attorney.[5] This action of Sumner's is the only one noted during the period following the extension to the colored people of civil rights in the District by the law of 1862 to the adoption of the general civil rights bill of 1866, proposing to make an appeal to the courts for the enforcement of existing law. Instead of taking the street-car company into court, when it began the discrimination in the fall of 1862, what effort was made to stop the practice was directed entirely to securing additional laws. The colored people generally were not assertive. How gradually they made use of even such a broad civil right as witnessing the proceedings of congress may be inferred from two instances. In the spring of 1862 Senator Garrett Davis of Kentucky called the attention of the senate to what he regarded as a remarkable circumstance, as he noticed several negroes standing at the open gallery doors listening to the proceedings.[1] While four years later Senator Saulsbury of Delaware declared as something evidently unusual that he could "see any time in these galleries colored men witnessing the deliberations of this body." [2] In the fall of 1863, when the National or Grover's Theatre was remodelled, the gallery was divided into two sections, one for the whites and the other for the colored,[3] thus making no change in current usage. At that time the first colored Odd Fellows' parade was held in the city, the occasion being a meeting of the grand body, the first time the sessions were held south of Mason and Dixon's line.[4] It was perhaps just as well for the peace of the community that the negro did not insist upon an immediate change in his relations in the community, as the notion of his inferiority was so deep-seated that race hostility was easily aroused. This was shown when it was proposed that he should be used as a soldier. The army officers were opposed to it, but by the summer of 1863, when he had displayed the soldierly qualities of bravery and obedience to orders at Milliken's Bend and Fort Wagner, much of this feeling in the army disappeared. The popular sense was offended, however, at the sight of a colored man in the uniform of the United States army, and there were outbreaks of this feeling at times in the streets of Washington during the summer of 1863 while the recruiting of the first colored District regiment was going on.[5] From a nucleus of

---

[1] *Globe*, Feb. 20, 1865, p. 915.

[2] A souvenir, Busey, p. 306.

[3] *The Star*, Jan. 29, 1863.

[4] The same, Aug. 31, 1863, Feb. 15, 1867, and March 1, 1867.

---

[1] Stats., 12, 537, March 3, 1865.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 11, 1868.

[3] *Globe*, p. 1029, Feb. 23, 1865.

---

[1] Jay Cooke, p. 189, Sept. 1, 1863.

[2] *Globe*, p. 373, June 21, 1863.

[3] *The Star*, June 10, 1863. Speech at a colored meeting, John Wesley Church.

[4] *Globe*, p. 1141, March 16, 1864.

[5] Sumner. Pierce, p. 180.

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 1339, March 24, 1862.

[2] The same, p. 1507, March 19, 1866.

[3] *The Star*, Sept. 24, 1863.

[4] The same, Oct. 9, 1863.

[5] *Baltimore Sun*, June 4, 1863.

two companies formed as the result of public meetings held in various colored churches, by the fall a regiment of 990 men had been formed. Then a second regiment of 800 men was organized.[1] At first the men, forming a couple of companies without uniforms or arms, were encamped in the vicinity of Israel Church at South Capitol and B streets.[2] Then the recruits were removed to Analostan Island,[3] where the recruiting was continued under the direction of Colonel William Birney, who had been appointed inspector for colored troops for the District.

Citizens who were disturbed in the summer of 1863 because they saw negroes wearing the uniform of the United States army as well as those whose sense of justice was offended by the exclusion of the race from the cars felt no doubt that these were minor matters when they heard the thunder of artillery to the west and realized that a military demonstration was being made against the city or rather in the direction of the city. For while each year of the four that the war lasted the enemy came in force within at least thirty miles of the city, yet it was not until the last year that an actual attempt was made to enter the city.

The exhaustion of the confederate troops after the First Bull Run in 1861 made a forward movement of some thirty miles to Washington impossible. The following year, after the rout of the Second Bull Run and Lee swept onward to the north, his advance finally culminating in the battle of Antietam, the nearest point to Washington reached was at Dranesville on the Georgetown-Leesburgh Pike, twenty-two miles from Washington. The next year when the southern leader again marched north and, invading Pennsylvania, fought the battle of Gettysburg, scouting parties of the advance crossed the Potomac River into Maryland only six or seven miles above Georgetown.[1] It was a nervous time in the city, where the sound of the firing was distinctly heard. The military organization of the quartermaster's department was called out for patrol duty.[2] The previous year, when excitement and alarm held undisputed sway, all the government employés were called to arms.[3] Unlike the military movements of 1862 and of 1863, which were designed primarily, in the first instance, to bring over Maryland to the confederate cause and, in the second, to carry the war into the north, the purpose of the Early expedition in 1864 was to draw Grant's army from Richmond. Grant, however, sent to Washington the Sixth Corps and part of the Nineteenth, and it was the arrival of these troops on the afternoon of July 11, 1864, that saved the city. Early, flushed with the victory over the Union forces at the bridge of the Monocacy, a few miles from Frederick, reached Fort Stevens on the 7th Street Road, four miles north of Washington, within sight of the dome of the capitol, on the morning of that day and, having a superior force, could have made his way to the city and done much damage. Besides he would have done that which a cordon of forts and a great massing of men throughout the greatest part of the war had been designed to prevent. The conditions were favorable, as just then the northern defences of the city were but poorly manned. The opportunity was not seized. That afternoon the reënforcements arrived, and while some skirmishing took place the next day as well as a sharp engagement, of which President Lincoln, standing on the parapet of Fort Stevens, was a spectator and was exposed for a time to the fire,[4] yet that evening Early withdrew from the vicinity of the city and crossed the Potomac at White Fords, Loudoun County, Va. Before going, however, he burned the country residence of Montgomery Blair, the postmaster-general, at Silver Spring.

---

[1] Rebellion Records, Series 3, Vol. 3, p. 1112.

[2] *The Star*, May 8, 13, 16 and 22; *Baltimore Sun*, May 16 and 20, 1863.

[3] At that time the stone residence occupied by John Mason, the Georgetown merchant, as early as 1810 (Warden, p. 134), was still standing, but some four years later it was destroyed by fire. It was then rebuilt by the lessee, who continued the place as a pleasure resort (*The Star*, June 10, 1867), as it had been for some time prior to the war. (The same, June 19, 1860.)

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, June 30, 1863.

[2] The same, June 29, 1863.

[3] Rebellion Records, Vol. 12, part 3, p. 807. *The Star*, Sept. 3 and 12, 1862.

[4] Lincoln, Nicolay and Hay, Vol. 9, p. 168. Washington during War Time, pp. 64 and 81.

Three months after the capital city made this narrow escape the presidential campaign came to an end with the reëlection of President Lincoln. Early the following year preparations were made for the inaugural procession and ball, but only by members of the dominant party. The general committee was composed of representatives of the local Lincoln and Johnson Club and a number of state organizations.[1] On account of the expense as well as the condition of the country a concert was favored by some rather than a ball.[2] As, however, the model room in the east wing of the patent office, the completion of which had been delayed until this time, owing to its use as a hospital, with the large rooms in the other wings for promenade and supper purposes, had been secured and there would be no expense to provide a building, the verdict favored a ball. While the charge was $10 including supper, and the ball was not held until the Monday following inaugural day, which fell on Saturday, yet the attendance was about 4000.[3] Apparently the success of this festival feature of the occasion was threatened, owing to the spread of rumors that tickets had been sold to colored people. In making an emphatic denial on behalf of the managers, who were all members of the dominant party, the *Chronicle,* that had always been radical on the negro question, rather disingenuously explained the position of the committee by asserting that "the ball is a private affair, in which the parties concerned have a perfect right to invite whom they please and exclude whom they please, irrespective of color."[4] However, there is no record that objection was made to the colored man appearing in the inaugural procession, and while two companies of colored troops and a colored lodge of Odd Fellows were in line, the circumstance was not mentioned in the local newspapers and was allowed to pass without public comment, although it was the first time the race had taken part in the inaugural ceremonies.[1] The wet weather of the day preceding the inauguration and the threatening skies of the early portion of the day itself had left their mark in muddy streets, and while that was not a new factor on such occasions, still the procession fell into a minor place. It was almost entirely civic in character and also local, as the only organizations from the outside were several fire companies from Philadelphia.[2] A little more than a month after the inauguration the thunder of a salute of 500 guns that had been brought to Massachusetts Avenue between 13th and 14th streets from Camp Barry, the artillery instruction camp in the eastern section of the city, was the official announcement of the surrender of Lee. "The thrilling intelligence buzzed about at a late hour" of the preceding night, which was the evening of the day of the surrender, "filled the streets" the next day, which was Monday, "with crowds of people almost wild with excitement."[3] There was no thought of work. The government departments, the city offices and places of business were closed. "Salutes, bell ringing and the music of myriad bands were heard on all sides."[4] In the afternoon, at the request of Mayor Wallach, a battery from Camp Barry took position in front of the city hall and fired a salute of 200 guns, and the city council paid for the shattered window glass in that structure. The rejoicing crowds formed processions, and headed by bands and singing the Star-spangled Banner, Old Hundred and other favorites, marched through the streets. The White House became the centre, and a number of times President Lincoln, recognizing, as he said, "the exuberance of feeling, for all of which they are greatly justified,"[5] appeared at an upper window in the White House and spoke informally to the enthusiastic people. On the following evening of Tuesday, to a great throng at the White House entrance, the president spoke with earnestness and feeling and, as it proved, made his last public address. Thursday night the city was ablaze with light. The buildings, public and private, were illuminated. Lanterns were used, and names and phrases formed by gas-jets flashed and glowed, while the windows were ablaze with candles, — as many as sixty being used in one of the windows of the city hall.[1] The following evening, five days after receiving the happy intelligence from Appomattox, the nation-wide rejoicing over the news that meant the end of the war was changed to the deepest grief. For Lincoln, enjoying the play at Ford's Theatre, was shot by John Wilkes Booth, an erratic actor, a man of intemperate habits and a violent southern sympathizer. Passing the servant, the only guard at the entrance to the passageway to the box, by merely showing his card, Booth secured the door with a wooden bar prepared for this use and entered the box. Approaching the president from behind, as he sat with Mrs. Lincoln and Major Rathbone and Miss Harris, intent on the play, he placed a pistol to his head and fired, shouting "Sic semper tyrannus."

---

[1] *The Star*, Jan. 17, 1865. Lewis Clephane was made chairman of the general committee, B. B. French, of the ball committee, and Daniel R. Goodloe, marshal of the parade.

[2] The same, Feb. 9, 1865.

[3] *Star* and *Chronicle*, March 7, 1865.

[4] *Chronicle,* March 2, 1865.

---

[1] *New York Tribune*, March 4, 1865. Recollections, Gobright, p. 342.

[2] *The Star* and *Chronicle*, March 4, 1865.

[3] *The Star*, April 10, 1865.

[4] The same.

[5] The same, April 11, 1865.

Then striking with his dagger at Major Rathbone, who started to seize him, he jumped to the stage. One of his spurs caught in the flag that draped the box and he fell, breaking a leg. Springing to his feet and waving his dagger to the audience, that did not realize what had happened, he hurried to the back of the stage and thence to the alley where his horse was in waiting. Mounting, he dashed to F Street and thence to the bridge across the Eastern Branch.

Lincoln was removed to the house, 516 10th Street, on the opposite side of the street from the theatre. Shortly after seven the next morning he died without having recovered consciousness. Lewis Payne, one of Booth's associates in the conspiracy, which first contemplated the kidnapping of the president, Vice-president Johnson, the secretary of state, Mr. Seward and General Grant, about the same time that Booth entered the theatre, forced his way into the residence of Secretary Seward on Madison Place, now the site of Belasco's Theatre, where the secretary was confined to his bed as the result of a runaway carriage accident. After severely wounding him and his son and two attendants, Payne made his escape from the house, but was subsequently arrested at the residence of Mrs. Surratt, 604 H Street northwest, where Booth had been in the habit of meeting his fellow-conspirators.

---

[1] *The Star*, April 14, 1865.

The deed, so unexpected and so mysterious, created the wildest excitement as well as the profoundest sorrow in the city. Within a short time after the body of President Lincoln was removed to the White House, the city was draped in black. Again all public buildings and places of business were closed, in this particular repeating the scenes of earlier in the week. But instead of bells rung in rejoicing they were tolled; the flags hung at half-mast. The signs of mourning were visible in the draped buildings, the sad countenances and the badges of grief.[1] The theatres and concert halls were closed. About two hours after the death of Lincoln the vice-president, Andrew Johnson, was sworn in by Chief Justice Chase as president of the United States, at the Kirkwood House, where Mr. Johnson lived.[2] For four days the city mourned. The body of the dead president lay in the east room of the White House. Then, after religious services, the remains were removed to the rotunda of the capitol, where they lay in state. On the evening of the 20th the journey to the last resting-place at Springfield, Ill., was begun.

The pursuit of the murderer ended in a barn on a farm three miles from Port Royal, Caroline County, Va., when an unauthorized shot from one of the military pursuing party ended the life of Booth. A military commission tried those arrested for complicity in the conspiracy, and after a hearing of seven weeks in a room in the old penitentiary building at the foot of 4½ Street, Payne, Herold, Atzerodt and Mrs. Surratt were hung in the yard of the prison.[1]

---

[1] *The Star*, April 15, 1865. Lincoln, Nicolay and Hay, Vol. 10, p. 316.

[2] Mrs. Lincoln occupied the White House for several weeks. President Johnson became the guest of Representative Samuel Hooper of Massachusetts at his residence at the northwest corner of 15th and H streets, which he had purchased in 1863 from J. H. B. Smith, the son of Samuel Harrison Smith. The president had an office in the treasury building. Reminiscences, Poore, Vol. 2, p. 181.

Hardly a month after the funeral procession of Lincoln passed along Pennsylvania Avenue, to the measure of dirges and in the sombre setting of crape-shrouded buildings, the veterans of the army of the Potomac and of the army of Sherman marched over this thoroughfare and were reviewed by President Johnson and men prominent in military and official life, who occupied a stand in front of the White House. Opposite on the north side of the avenue was a large stand for members of congress and state officials, with smaller stands at either side for the families of the officers on parade and citizens who had come from different parts of the country.[2] As the war-stained ranks advanced in files, extending from one side of the broad thoroughfare to the other, the happy spectators showered them with flowers. For two days the spectacle continued, and in a very brief space of time this great army of 200,000 men passed from military life to resume again their places among their fellow-citizens.

Some months after the soldiers were mustered out, the chain of forts surrounding the city was dismantled, the buildings sold for old material and the land returned to the owners.[3] A like process went on with the groups of buildings used for hospital purposes, although in such a case as that of Campbell Hospital at the head of 6th Street it was turned over to the Freedmen's Bureau and used as a hospital for the colored people, the beginning of what became the Freedmen's Hospital. Other hospital structures were used for a time by the government for storage and other purposes, while the lumber of the 14th Street structures was utilized, to some extent, in building houses in the new subdivision of Mount Pleasant or Clerksville, as it came to be known, which was placed on the market during the summer of 1865.[1] The army and the forts and hospitals and the lucrative trade in sutler and other army supplies had gone, but the population largely remained.[2] It might naturally have been expected that the crowd would go with the flush times. Many did. At the same time many came to take government positions, as the civil list then, as now, reflected the growth of the country and the increase in government activities.[3] Even during the war period, not merely the clerical service of the war and navy department increased, but the substitution of paper money for gold and silver coins, the currency of the new national banking system and the great issue of bonds and notes made necessary the creation in 1861 of what became the bureau of engraving and printing as a part of the

---

[1] This building, with the exception of the houses on the east and west front, was torn down in 1868.

[2] Reminiscences, Poore, Vol. 2, p. 189.

[3] *The Chronicle*, Nov. 1, 1865.

---

[1] Historic Sketches of Washington, Townsend, p. 447. Mount Pleasant, p. 15.

[2] There was no census in 1865, only an estimate by the city authorities (*Chronicle*, Oct. 30) of 125,000 for Washington and Georgetown alone, leaving out a probable 8000 for Washington County. The excess over the 126,000 District population reported by the Commissioner of Education's census of 1867 may be largely attributed to lack of accuracy.

[3] The following summary of government employés in the District is taken from the Blue Books except for the navy-yard employés for 1861, for which my authority is Bohn's Handbook of Washington for that year, and for 1865, Hibbens, Washington Navy Yard, p. 150. Reports of the public printer give the employés in that office.

	1861	1865
State	36	38
Treasury	495	2121
Interior	702	707
War	281	1668
Navy	80	109
Judiciary	17	19
Congress employés	157	166
Post Office	141	181
Library of congress	7	8
Agriculture		29
Printing-office	350	900
Navy yard	1200	1239
	3466	7184

treasury department. For while the bonds and currency continued to be printed by private concerns in New York, as had been the custom in the case of the bonds from the beginning of the government,[1] yet a force was needed at the treasury department to trim and separate the sheets of notes.

The establishment of the printing bureau marked the entrance of women into the government service. When the office of the comptroller of the currency was opened, two years later, two young ladies were included in the clerical force.[2] As was the case in private employment then and for many years later, the rate of pay was less than that of the male clerks.[3] As the settlement of the west went on rapidly and territories were formed and then states, the business of the interior department soon outstripped its facilities, and then in 1865 and 1866 the device was adopted of keeping the clerks at work until four o'clock each day instead of three.[4] From time to time by departmental orders the longer day was adopted in other departments, although in some years the three o'clock closing hour was observed during the summer months. As was not uncommon, the civil list at this period held the names of men who achieved distinction in other walks of life. A few years previously James McNeill Whistler, the artist, after he left West Point in 1854, was a clerk for a short time in the coast survey.[5] For a number of years, and up to the time of his death in 1867, L. F. Tasistro, a literary and dramatic critic, held the position of translator in the department of state. Edward D. Neill published in 1867 "Terræ Mariæ" while in the government service.[6] For eleven years Walt Whitman was a resident of Washington, having gone there in 1862 and devoted himself to visiting the military hospitals, earning his living in the meanwhile by newspaper correspondence and temporary clerical work for the government. He secured a clerkship in 1865. During this period he published the "Voyage to India." Covering practically the same period as that of Whitman's life in Washington, John Burroughs spent his days at a desk in the office of the comptroller of the currency. His delightful observations of bird life about Washington are preserved in his "Wake Robin." About the time Whitman and Burroughs came to the city E. C. Steadman, the poet, gave up a clerkship and went to New York city, where he became a banker. In addition to the steadying power of the growth of the departmental service in checking the effect on the city of the collapse of the war inflation, the natural outflow of the surplus population was balanced by the constant inflow of the colored people that was neither prompted, nor checked, by economic considerations.[1]

---

[1] 38th Cong., 2d Sess., House Ex. Doc. No. 50, Feb. 6, 1865; 40th Cong., 3d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 273, March 3, 1869.

[2] Men and Manners of Half a Century, McCullough, p. 166.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 3, 1868.

[4] The same, Oct. 2, 1868.

[5] *The Star*, March 16, 1910.

[6] Historic Sketches of Washington, p. 448.

Six months after peace, instead of property being at a discount, as might be inferred would be the case, complaints were made that the supply of houses was limited and in consequence rents were high.[2] The police, now that the military patrol was withdrawn, found difficulty in restraining disorder and preventing crime.[3] As much of it was attributed to unemployment, this condition served to emphasize the feeling of many citizens that something ought to be done to increase the commerce and trade of the city. The citizens were ripe for a suggestion to form a board of trade, and for the first time such an organization came into existence.[4] At its head was placed George W. Riggs, the senior member of the banking firm of Riggs and Co. In considering the needs of the city the conclusion was reached by the board that the chief lack was more and better railway communication. In this respect there had been no change since the Alexandria and Washington Railway was built in 1855, except the double tracking of the Baltimore and Ohio line. In the summer of 1863, while the operation of the road to Alexandria was still in the hands of the government, an attempt was made by new interests, that had obtained control of the property, to provide a more direct connection south of Alexandria. A promising beginning was made. At once one of the chief defects in the southern connection, the lack of a railroad bridge over the Potomac, was cured, as the company built a bridge just south of the Long Bridge.[1] Then a charter was secured from the Virginia legislature by the same interests to build a road from Alexandria to Quantico, a proposed new terminus of the Richmond railroad. In addition the privilege was secured to use steam on the city streets. The company agreed with congress to bring its line east of the capitol by means of a tunnel and agreed with the city to pay the $60,000 loaned to it by the city in 1855. But it did neither.[2] For a few months after the extended charter rights had been gained, the bridge was rendered useless by a freshet.[3] While the Long Bridge was also damaged, yet that was repaired by the government. Then what with litigation over the property, due to its sale while the former owners were still absent in the south, the company neither made good the injuries done to the bridge nor undertook to build the Quantico line. Without authority either from congress or the city council the company laid its tracks on Long Bridge and continued to have its cars drawn by steam through the city to the Baltimore and Ohio depot.

---

[1] In 1866 the Freedmen's Bureau estimated the colored population of Washington and Georgetown to be 31,549, while a year later the census taken by the commissioner of education gave the number as 35,221.

[2] *Chronicle*, Sept. 7 and Oct. 30, 1865.

[3] The same, Sept. 12 and Oct. 2, 1865. At the following session of congress the force was increased from 150 to 220, one to about 550 of population.

[4] The same, Oct. 13, 25 and 27, 1865.

Apparently its importance as the only southern connection, had much to do with its continued hold on privileges to which it was not entitled. Citizens protested against the unguarded surface tracks as dangerous to life and the noise of the engines as injurious to health. The Washington board of trade, while voicing these objections, also charged that the controlling influence in the road, the Baltimore and Ohio Co., was hostile to the business interests of the community. Discrimination both in freight and in passenger rates, the board claimed, was made in favor of Baltimore against Washington, so that Baltimore merchants could send goods to the south cheaper than Washington merchants.[1] No doubt it was the thought of many, who still believed that Washington could be made a commercial city, that such discrimination explained in large part why manufacturing plants were located in Baltimore instead of in Washington. Besides, Washington business men undoubtedly recalled the circumstance of two years before, in the midst of war, when the incomes of government employés remained stationary, while the cost of living soared to unprecedented levels, that the Baltimore and Ohio Co. had offered to provide a special train morning and evening between Washington and Baltimore, so that residents of the capital city could avail themselves of the cheaper house rents and lower food prices of the Monumental city.[2] The train service was provided as well as special rates, and a beginning was made, of a practice that never, however, reached large proportions, of men in business in Washington, more especially in the government service, having their homes in Baltimore.

---

[1] Stats., 12, 805, March 3, 1863. *The Star*, March 18 and June 9, 1863. 38th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 1, Dec. 5, 1863.

[2] Stats., 14, 248, and 435, July 25, 1866 and March 21, 1867. Ordinance, May 24, 1866. For an account of the Virginia railroad see a History of the Southern Railway, p. 1487.

[3] *The Star*, Feb. 5 and 7, 1867.

There was no such enterprise shown in the management of the southern connection. As late as the fall of 1867, owing to an accident which disabled the only engine on the Alexandria road, all operation of the line was suspended while the engine was sent to Baltimore to be repaired.[3] It was probably not looked upon by citizens as due to any special regard for local interests that led the Baltimore and Ohio, a few months after the war, to plan to connect Washington directly with the west. It was designed to shorten the route and no longer compel travellers to go forty-nine miles out of the way in order to put Baltimore on the route to Washington. The growing importance of the west and the influence in congress of members from that section was no doubt a controlling motive with the railroad company. At any rate no delay was encountered in securing from congress authority to enter the city, but it was left to the city authorities to determine the route within the urban limits. At first it was proposed by the city council to make, as a condition of granting such a right, the payment to the corporation of the taxes assessed by the corporation which the railroad company had for years refused to pay.[1] The railroad company adopted the same tactics it did in 1849 when it dealt with the city authorities in regard to a depot site. For the mayor was informed by the president of the company, John W. Garrett, that unless the city granted an entrance on favorable terms they would not come in at all, but join the Baltimore-Washington line at Bladensburg just outside of the District bounds.[2] Then the city council overlooked the back taxes and hastened to grant the right of way which the company wanted without exacting any conditions.[3] In addition the city granted a further extension of thirty years to the term in which the company would be allowed to use steam cars on the streets, a privilege which both congress and the city granted to the Alexandria Co., but with the stipulation of valuable considerations. This difference in the treatment of the two corporations was not reflected in the attitude of the Baltimore and Ohio Co., as from time to time it refused to change the grade of its road in conformity with the street grades, ignored the protests of the city authorities as to the use of the streets in the vicinity of the depot for the storage of cars, besides maintaining its policy of not paying city taxes.[1] The latter part of 1866, a few months before the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co. secured an entrance into the city for its new branch, the contest was begun by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. which ended five years later in wresting the southern connection from its older rival, that had never acquired a permanent control of any of the Virginia lines. The Pennsylvania pursued a different policy. For after building a line from its Baltimore terminus to Washington, it acquired from congress the control of the Long Bridge as well as a right of way through the city, with its depot on the public reservation at 6th and B streets northwest, and thence to its newly completed line from the south end of the Long Bridge through Alexandria to Quantico.[2]

---

[1] *Chronicle*, Nov. 16, 1865. Also Journal, 67th Council, p. 925, Dec. 20, 1869.

[2] *The Star*, Sept. 12 and 17, 1863.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Sept. 7, 1867.

---

[1] Journal, 63d Council, p. 196, Sept. 11, 1865.

[2] The same, 64th Council, p. 360, Dec. 3, 1866.

[3] Ordinance, Jan. 17, 1867. This new line, known as the Metropolitan Branch, left the main line at Point of Rocks, Md., and entered the city at New York Avenue, and thence along 1st Street east to a junction with the existing line near H Street. It was completed in 1870.

The citizens' movement, started at the close of the war to create new interests to take the place of those lost to the city when it ceased to be a military centre, had behind it the good-will of all the citizens. It was quite different with the movement begun at this time to give the franchise to the negro. Outside of a few citizens and the colored race, the people of the District did not favor this change. In this particular they were not peculiar, as at this time the people of three northern states[3] had by vote refused to extend the franchise to the colored man. There were only six states where he had a vote. As was the case when the colored people in the District were given their freedom, the issue was not local but national. It was decided by congress with entire reference to national not local conditions. By the fall of 1865 action was hastened because President Johnson had assumed what was looked upon as a prerogative of congress in carrying out a reconstruction policy, and especially that feature of it which allowed the states to determine whether or not the negro should be admitted to the franchise.

---

[1] Journal 67th Council, p. 98, July 19, 1869.

[2] The line from Baltimore through Washington to Quantico was opened July 2, 1872. History of the Pennsylvania Railroad, Vol. 1, p. 353.

[3] In 1865, Connecticut, Wisconsin and Minnesota refused the negro enfranchisement, in 1867, Kansas and Ohio cast a similar vote; and in 1868, Michigan. Rhodes, Vol. 6, p. 89.

The mutterings of disapproval of the president's policy made the citizens apprehensive that when congress met radical action would be taken in regard to District negro suffrage as a sort of national object lesson. A month before that body met the mayor was requested by resolution of the city council to call a special session in the contingency that District negro suffrage was taken up in the national legislature, so that arrangements could be made to submit the matter to a vote of the people. Those friendly to negro suffrage had the same notion about the probable course of congress. Organizations were formed, some weeks before congress met, to promote such legislation. At the head of one society, with branches in each ward,[1] was John F. Cook, a colored man, who had succeeded his father, for whom he was named, as teacher of a colored private school. He had been educated at Oberlin. The colored people in other parts of the country realized the effect of action in the District. Those in New York state and in Ohio raised money and sent to Washington Frederick Douglass and John M. Lanston.[2] An illustration of the temper of the times is found in the experience of being unable to rent a hall in Washington where Douglass could deliver a lecture. The ladies interested in the home for destitute colored women and children,[3] many of whom were the wives of leading Republican members of the senate and of the house, had asked him to help this cause by delivering a lecture. They tried to find a hall, but as their purpose was to secure a forum for a colored speaker, they were unsuccessful. After considerable opposition from the officers and members, the use of the First Presbyterian

---

[1] *The Star*, Nov. 11 and 22; *The Chronicle*, Nov. 15, 1865.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 14, 1865. Life and Times of Frederick Douglass, p. 393.

[3] The institution chartered by congress was opened in 1863 in the home erected by Richard S. Cox, on the place of his father, John Cox, The Cedars, on the west side of 35th Street between Q and R streets (*The Star*, May 29, 1863), now the site of the Western High School. When the property which had been confiscated by the government was restored to the owner in 1866, the institution was removed to a building erected for its use by the Freedmen's Bureau on 8th Street north of Florida Avenue.

Church was secured and the lecture was delivered, but the church suffered in loss of members and in harmony.[1]

The president of another impartial suffrage association which was intended to be national in its scope with branches throughout the country was Sayles J. Bowen, the postmaster of the city. He was the District man to whom President Lincoln had oftenest turned when he was in need of some one to fill a District office. At that time, besides the postmastership, he also held the presidential appointments of member of the levy court, of the board of colored school trustees and of the board of police commissioners.

Like a good many other citizens of Washington, Bowen, when he first came to the city in 1845, was a clerk in one of the departments. Three years later he lost his place and then established himself in the claims business. He accumulated some money, as he was a man of good business ability and excellent habits. He rendered service in the Republican campaign of 1860, and when the first Republican congress assembled in July, 1861, Bowen got an appointment in the office of the secretary of the senate, where he served as disbursing officer. In 1862 he was made collector of internal revenue for the District, but a year later he exchanged places with Lewis Clephane, the postmaster of the city. As president of the Freedmen's Aid Society he early became conspicuous as a radical advocate of the cause of the colored people. During the twenty years he had lived in the city he made many friends, but, as it proved, his suspicious nature made permanence in friendship impossible.[2]

At this time he disregarded all such ties when he broke forth in a newspaper communication, denouncing the citizens of the District as traitors and sympathizers with the late rebellion, a favorite attitude of radical Republicans towards those opposed to the negro policy.[1] The immediate cause of this outburst was the action of the city council in directing that the legal voters be asked on a certain day to declare by ballot their opinion on giving the franchise to the colored man.[2] The Georgetown council did the same thing, and as a result of the voting Washington went on record against negro suffrage by a vote of 6591 to 35, while the vote in Georgetown was 712 against and 1 for.[3] Congress did what had been anticipated. As soon as it met in December, 1865, bills were introduced in both houses providing for District negro suffrage. In spite of the expression of opinion from District citizens, the house passed such a bill, and the senate would have done the same only it was not thought it could be passed over the president's veto.[4] As indicating the intense feeling that prevailed, some of the members of the house, when they were confronted with the expression of the views of the citizens, followed the example of Bowen and branded them as traitors, one speaker going so far as to declare that "the ballot-box at the special election doubtless received many ballots from fingers that pulled rebel triggers."[5] It was also asserted that the friends of equal rights had abstained from voting. However that may have been, the vote cast was slightly larger than that at the preceding and following mayoralty elections.[6] As was also the case with District emancipation, many in congress looked on negro suffrage as an experiment and the District as a good place to try it.[1] That it was a political measure designed for its effect upon the country at large rather than to meet any real need in the District is evident from the discussions. It was merely preliminary to the general measure that was to express the reconstruction plan of congress as opposed to that of the president. Unless all that had been aimed at in going to war was to be sacrificed, according to much of the current belief, the negro must be given political equality.[2] The four daily papers, the *Star*, the *Chronicle*, the *Republican* and the *Intelligencer*, were equally divided, taking sides as they favored the plan of congress or that of the president.[3] The national character of this measure is also evident from the course of Lot M. Morrill of Maine, a leading Republican and chairman of the senate District committee. For while he declared the District suffrage bill was expected by the country and he did what he could to enact it into a law, at the same time he introduced into the senate, and subsequently reported favorably from the District committee, the most elaborate bill, providing a form of government for the District, that had ever been drawn.[4] It was this measure which was designed to meet District needs in Mr. Morrill's opinion. He did not say that of the suffrage bill. It proposed to do away with popular government, including of course the franchise, except as to such city offices as a comptroller, a register, a tax collector and assessors.[5] It ran counter to the current notion advanced by the dominant political party, of the elective franchise as an educative, elevating influence. As Mr. Morrill declared, the purpose of intrusting the government of the entire District to a board of three commissioners appointed by the president was to have congress assume the function which it originally started with. The District, he said, was never intended to be a government. "It is a seat," he asserted, "of the government of the United States."[6] In this connection he presented a petition signed by taxpayers, stating that the existing, separate municipalities in the District have distinct and often conflicting laws and that taxes are greater with less improvements than would be the case if the charters were abolished and congress became the only lawmaker. Such a governmental change was favored by resolutions adopted by the board of trade.[1] The preamble declared that the municipal corporations are unequal to making the capital city what our national "grandeur requires, but tends to impede our progress, delays local affairs and cramps local energies."

---

[1] *The Star* and *The Chronicle*, Feb. 12, 1866, and subsequent dates. Also from the church records as printed in the church paper, *The First Presbyterian*, September, 1887.

[2] This defect had much to do with his repudiation by his party at the close of his term as mayor. That ended his political career and, as it proved, no other opened. In addition, by unfortunate investments, he lost what money he had. He died at an advanced age in reduced circumstances. I have been helped in forming an estimate of Bowen by conversations with Dr. William Tindall, who was his secretary when he was mayor of the city.

---

[1] *Chronicle*, Dec. 18, 1865. See also *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 19, as to the attitude of Bowen's friends.

[2] Ordinance, Dec. 16, 1865.

[3] *Globe*, p. 133, Jan. 8, 1866; Journal, 63d Council, p. 477.

[4] Rhodes, Vol. 5, note, p. 598.

[5] *Globe*, p. 174, Jan. 10, 1866.

[6] The vote in June, 1864, was 5726, and in June, 1866, 5776, while the negro suffrage vote in December, 1865, was 6620. The stay-at-home vote was growing. In 1860 the number of votes cast was within two per cent of the estimated number of legal voters, while six years later nearly 45 per cent did not vote.

---

[1] *Globe*, pp. 179 and 246, Jan. 10, 1866.

[2] *The Star*, March 26, 1867.

[3] *Intelligencer*, Jan. 9, 1867. Poore's Reminiscences, Vol. 2, p. 194.

[4] The same, Jan. 10, 1866, pp. 162, 413 and 3193.

[5] *The Star*, Feb. 7, 1867.

[6] *Globe*, May 8, 1866, p. 2481.

At that time, owing to the patchwork character of legislation since 1862 relating to the government, the governmental agencies were not only numerous but conflicting. The corporate powers of Georgetown had been less affected than those of Washington or of the levy court. But still in Georgetown, as throughout the District, police functions, which had been extended so as to include liquor licenses and health regulation, were vested in a federal commission. At the same time the local governments furnished from their revenues one-third of the money expended by the police board. Besides, both Washington and Georgetown paid to the board for colored schools, a federal body, a bulk sum. This was disbursed by the board just as the city council each year provided for the white schools.

In this period, too, the levy court had been so transformed from the old-time Maryland institution, designed mainly to look after roads and bridges, that it then had the more important functions of a municipal government, such as the general levy of taxes, the issue of liquor and other licenses, the making of building regulations, and had also the power of appointing trustees of the county white schools just as was the case with the two town governments. In fact the levy court thus changed was similar to the county commissioner form of government as it existed in Ohio and in Maryland,[2] and a prototype of the District commission government of to-day.

There were further governmental complexities. Up to 1868 congress supplied the money for half the Washington street lighting. From 1863 to 1869 congress maintained a fire service of three steam engines, while the city had its own service of the same size. Then there was the care of the streets, which was a city affair, supplemented by the capricious aid of congress.

---

[1] *The Star*, Feb. 26 and March 5, 1867.

[2] *Record*, p. 5155, June 17, 1874. The same, p. 3607, May 21, 1878.

It can be said of the negro suffrage bill, from the standpoint of a District measure, that at this time congress showed more consideration for the wishes of the people in the states than it did for the people of the District. For at the session in 1866, when the District negro suffrage law was passed by the house, Tennessee was admitted as a state without a negro suffrage provision in its constitution. Both Colorado and Nebraska would have come in on the same terms if it had not been for the strained relations of the president and congress.

While the suffrage measure was favored in the District mainly by the colored people, the bill providing a commission government had behind it many of the property owners, whose motive was declared to be to quiet the suffrage agitation.[1] In addition there was, as has been stated, a considerable element among the citizens, especially of the substantial class, who believed with Mr. Morrill that an effective method of bringing to an end the period of mud and dust was to have a uniform, nonpolitical system of government for the entire District.[2] No doubt there was also an element that believed with the *Chronicle*, that the introduction of the colored vote would put the city government "into the hands of men of energy and undoubted loyalty, and when this change occurs, the District will waken from its lethargy."[3] The character of the Morrill government measure, more especially its practical abolition of popular government, aroused comment. In scornful contempt, it was declared on the floor of the house that "men are willing to surrender their own rights rather than to respect the rights of others,"[4] while Thomas A. Hendricks of Indiana, prominent in the councils of the Democratic party, observed in the senate in sarcastic vein, in reference to the franchise bill that had passed the house and the commission government bill pending in the senate, that the latter wants nobody in the District to vote, while the house proposes that everybody should vote.[1] The revival of the commission plan, which had been first proposed in 1860, because of dissatisfaction with the city administration, put in the background the one municipality plan for the entire District which had been favored by the directors of the board of trade before the prospects of negro suffrage legislation had become assured.[2] It was not a new proposition, as it had been considered at the breaking out of the war by committees of the two cities appointed on the initiative of Georgetown. Another proposed governmental change, which also was not new, provided for representation of the District in congress by a delegate. To this objection was raised that the interest of congress in District affairs would thereby be weakened.[3] Whatever prospects the delegate measure had were effectually closed, when at the beginning of the next session, in the fall of 1866, President Johnson in his annual message gave it his indorsement. For by that time the quarrel with the president had reached such a point that his approval of a measure was a sufficient reason to array the majority in congress against it. The forces against him had become so strong that the District suffrage bill was passed at this session over the veto. Its provisions were the same as to the colored franchise as were imposed on the southern states by the reconstruction plan that was adopted two months after the District suffrage bill became a law. For it provided for unrestricted male suffrage, as all males twenty-one years of age, not paupers or criminals, who had lived in the District for one year and three months in the voting precinct were allowed to vote. The existing restrictions, although slight in character and designed for revenue purposes, namely, a poll or school tax and the requirement on voters liable to a personal tax to pay it before being allowed to vote, were done away with.[1] Apparently to supply an oversight in the bill, a few weeks later congress directed that the duty of preparing the list of voters be taken from the Democratic mayor and board of aldermen and intrusted to a commission to be appointed by the supreme court of the District, a Republican body. Only Republicans were appointed.[2] Another symptom of the national character of the colored issue in the District was a growing sensitiveness in congress to opposition in the District. Richard Wallach, the mayor, declared that the District suffrage vote "has contributed no little to wean us from any kind feeling on the part of the majority of congress and forbids all hope of any assistance from that source."[3] In commenting upon the disinclination shown by "many old citizens" to register for the election of 1867 when the negro was to make his first appearance at the polls, the *Star*, an advocate of the plans of congress as opposed to that of the president, warningly said: "This would seem to put the people in the wrong attitude of resisting the action of congress. Every consideration of propriety and of interest in city affairs requires that the city should not antagonize congress."[4] When the mayor gave his estimate of the feeling of congress towards the District, he had just been reëlected for a third term. As he served one year of the unexpired term of Mayor Berret, when he finished his term in 1868 he had been at the head of the city government for seven years, a record second only to that of W. W. Seaton, who was mayor for ten years. Mayor Wallach was popular, had a pleasing personality and was a man of standing in the community. His administration was dignified and respectable, but lacked force and initiative. While this period had been eventful in the lives of the citizens and had brought the city to the threshold of a new era, yet village conditions still prevailed. The city government was blamed. As has been pointed out, the failure of the street improvement movement, which began so bravely in

---

[1] *Chronicle*, Sept. 18, Nov. 23; *New York Herald*, Nov. 22, 1865.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 28, 1867.

[3] Jan. 24, 1867.

[4] *Globe*, p. 174, Jan. 10, 1866.

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 3191.

[2] *Chronicle*, Nov. 23, 1865. The resolutions favoring the change were offered by Alexander R. Shepherd.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 23, 1865.

---

[1] Stats., 14, 375, Jan. 8, 1867.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 25, 1867.

[3] *Intelligencer*, June 5, 1866.

[4] March 20, 1867.

1864, was largely due to the great cost of paving such wide surfaces. It was due also to the limited resources of the community.

When a new start was made in city improvements under the territorial government, both of these conditions were taken into account. For, in addition to allowing the city authorities to lessen the roadways by means of parking, one-third instead of the whole cost of improvements was required of property holders. Besides a bond issue was permitted. Still, what was done in the 1864 movement would have been more efficient and the city government would have been in better odor, if it had not been for the practice of many citizens who had much at stake in the community, because of their property interests, their influence and standing, in shirking their civic duty by staying at home on election day. This had become a growing evil in Washington.[1] Although the white population, the only class eligible up to 1867 to cast a vote, was some 47 per cent greater in 1866 than in 1860, yet the vote at the mayoralty election of that year was actually less than it was in 1860. When in the spring of 1867 "the eyes of the country were turned towards Washington" to watch "the experiment of negro suffrage,"[2] "a practical trial of the great question of universal suffrage upon the largest scale yet attempted in this country,"[3] the registration of the whites showed an increase of nearly seventy per cent over the total vote cast at the election in 1866. No doubt the removal of the franchise restrictions, slight as they were, had an influence, but the controlling factor in bringing out the stay-at-home vote was the fear of negro domination. As it proved, the white registered voters outnumbered the colored by 1500. They were, however, divided politically, while the colored people were a unit. In addition, when the actual test came, a large number of the whites who registered did not take the trouble to go to the polls, as only 44 per cent of the white registered vote was cast for the collector, the principal Democratic candidate. On the other hand, the Republican nominee for that office received a few more votes than the entire number of registered colored voters. "The colored men turned out and marched in squads of a dozen to one hundred to the polling places."[1] The election in all its stages, from the ward meetings and the nominating convention to the casting of the ballots, passed off with but little disorder, as the colored men behaved at the polls with "the propriety and discretion"[2] they had displayed during the active and exciting campaign. One of the aldermen elect declared in a public address, "going into the political campaign with the trembling fears of the best of the conservative element in the community that you [referring to the colored people] would become a power for evil, your conduct has wrenched from them approval."[3] The Republican leaders realized the importance of the Washington election on the attitude of the American people towards the great experiment that was to be attempted the following fall in the southern states. They counselled not alone orderly behavior on the part of the negroes, but urged the value of a large vote, as showing that the race really wanted this privilege. For this reason, although the local labor market was overstocked, yet the negroes refused to leave the city in search of employment until after the election.[4] This condition suggested one of those philanthropic schemes of which the times were so prolific, especially in relation to the colored race, which aimed to solve the problem of employment as well as to test the capability of the colored farmer to be self-supporting. What was known as the Barry farm of 375 acres on the south side of the Eastern Branch, between the property of the Government Hospital and Uniontown, was purchased by the Freedmen's Bureau through trustees, who were General O. O. Howard, at the head of the bureau, Senator S. C. Pomeroy of Kansas and John R. Elvans, a local business man, who was identified with the Republican party and later on was elected to the city council. The property was divided into parcels of one and two acres and sold on a credit of three years.[5] In the course of two years

---

[1] Journal, 65th Council, p. 687, May 25, 1868.

[2] *The Star*, May 10, 1867.

[3] *Chronicle*, June 3, 1867.

[1] *Chronicle*, June 4, 1867.

[2] *The Star*, May 10, 1867.

[3] The same, June 7, 1867.

[4] The same, May 8, 1867.

[5] The same, April 26, and *Baltimore Sun*, Sept. 9, 1867.

there was a settlement there of 500 colored families, known as Potomac City, while near by was Stanton Town of about the same size.[1] It was at this period that the central office of the Freedmen's Saving and Trust Co. was located in this city in a building at Pennsylvania Avenue and 19th Street.[2] But the benevolent purpose of its incorporation by congress was defeated when that body removed the restriction confining the investment of deposits to United States bonds and stocks. But before the collapse came the property at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Place was purchased and a costly building erected.[3] Then, too, Howard University, chartered by congress in 1866, a year later had fifty colored students,[4] while the same year a large hospital building was erected in the vicinity by the Freedmen's Bureau for the use of the colored people. If such evidences of the change in the status of the colored people were not convincing to the citizens of Washington, they could read in the newspapers that Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts had introduced for the third time a bill for providing for negro social equality in the District.[5] The persistence of Sumner, which at times seemed to be fanaticism, led him to bring up some phase of the subject at every possible opportunity, even going to the extent of advocating mixed schools. But with some exceptions the negroes were not as keen about social as they were about political equality.

When the suffrage bill was passed by the house over the veto, this result was greeted with cheers and clapping of hands and waving of handkerchiefs by several hundred negroes who occupied seats in the gallery.[6] Such a scene was a striking contrast to the situation a few years before when the colored people did not venture farther than the gallery door.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Sept. 30, 1869.

[2] *The Star*, May 29, 1867.

[3] The price paid by the trust company for the property having a frontage of 186 feet on Pennsylvania Avenue, containing 25,298 square feet, and improved by a frame building on the corner, was $80,000. (*Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 16, 1869.) In 1863 it was sold for $63,000. (The same, May 14, 1863.)

[4] The same, July 20, 1867.

[5] The same, Jan. 7, 1867.

[6] The same, Jan. 9, 1867.

At this time the National Equal Rights League, representing by delegates the colored people of thirteen states, was in session in the city.[1] Resolutions were adopted commending the course of congress in doing what the people of the District had by ballot asked not to be done. What was really the first participation of the race in a popular election took place in Georgetown a couple of months before the Washington event. Then the mayoralty election was held. It was the subject of commendation similar to that which was given later on to the Washington election because of the orderly behavior of the colored people and the evidence they gave of good judgment and self-restraint.[2] The stay-at-home vote of the whites was as marked as in Washington. But the unpopularity of Henry Addison, the anti-negro suffrage candidate, so many years the mayor, helped to swell the vote of his successful opponent, Charles D. Welch, whose removal as tax collector was resented by some of the citizens. The complexion of the council, however, was not changed, although the colored registration was 70 per cent of the white.

At this period the colored people were not assertive. At the ward meetings they fell naturally into the humble places they had always been accustomed to at public gatherings when white people were present, — and occupied the rear seats or sat together on one side of the room.[3] It was the desire of some of the whites to bring into the new relation of the colored, as enfranchised citizens, the old-time separation, by forming two lines at the polls. This was not permitted by the superintendent of police, A. C. Richards.[4] Characteristic of the colored people, their own political meetings, which were held nightly in the various wards during the campaign preceding the first election, were invariably opened with prayer.[1] The colored men were content to vote for white men, although at one of the ward meetings they were told that Senator Sumner, who gave minute attention to District affairs when the interests of the race were involved, said he would like to see one or two colored men in the board of aldermen and a fair sprinkling in the common council. The speaker added that he would like to see "a black alderman alongside of Mayor Wallach. This would have a good effect on the unreconstructed states."[2] But only white men were chosen at the first election. At the nominating convention, however, when the slate was adopted, John F. Cook was elected to preside. After the election the new Republican tax collector appointed Cook to a clerkship in his office, while the Republican common council chose colored men to fill the positions of reading clerk and messenger.[3] It was not until the third election that the colored people received their proportion, according to population, in the common council. In the upper body they never had at one time more than one member.[4] Apparently such a representation

---

[1] *Chronicle*, Jan. 12, 1867.

[2] The same, Feb. 14 and 26, 1867.

[3] *The Star*, Feb. 15 and 28, 1867.

[4] *Chronicle*, June 6, 1867. Upon the resignation in 1864 of W. B. Webb, the first superintendent, Mr. Richards, who was a brother of Zalmon Richards and like him was a teacher of a private school, but at the time of this appointment held a position in the city post-office under Postmaster Bowen, was appointed by President Lincoln. He served in that position until 1878.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 21, 1867. It was not until the meeting of the third city council (Journal, 68th Council, p. 7, June 13, 1870) after colored men became members, that the practice of thus opening the proceedings was begun, and then only in one branch, the common council. One of the colored members who was a minister served as chaplain. In both branches of the territorial legislature the sessions were opened with prayer.

[2] *The Star*, May 2, 1867.

[3] The same, June 11, 1867.

[4] The list of colored representatives in the boards of aldermen and common council, consisting of fourteen and twenty-one members respectively, as prepared for me by Dr. William Tindall is as follows:—

66th Council, 1868–1869

John F. Cook, Alderman, light complexion, teacher;
Carter A. Stewart, Councilman, light, barber.

67th Council, 1869–1870

Carter A. Stewart, Alderman;
Robert Thompson, Councilman, black, caterer;
Henry Piper, Councilman, light, messenger;

was entirely satisfactory. It was in harmony with the practice in the general government service. For at this time the appointment of a colored man to a first-class clerkship in the treasury department was made the subject of a newspaper paragraph,[1] its importance being apparently due to the fact that a colored man had been given such a place rather than that he had served Lincoln as a barber. As to the subordinate places in the departments, many were filled by colored men,[2] and that became the custom in the city government as soon as Bowen, the colored people's candidate for mayor, was elected. The success of the Republican city ticket at the election in 1867 resulted in replacing the Democrats in three elective municipal offices with white Republicans and in addition gave that party the control in the common council.[3] While the election itself was peaceful, the results led to friction in the city government. Mayor Wallach could not reconcile himself to the new order. He continued his obstructive tactics in regard to the colored school fund and was resisted by the Republican register and common council, which resulted in a legislative dead-lock that not only held up the salaries of the school-teachers, but also the city's share of the pay of the police force,[4] in the latter instance violating for a time a law of congress. This disregard of the authority of the general government took a more positive

John T. Johnson, Councilman, light, cloak-room attendant at capitol;
George W. Hatton, Councilman, light, laborer;
Andrew B. Tinney, Councilman, black, brickmaker;
Frank D. Gaines, Councilman, light, laborer;
Sampson Netter, Councilman, black, preacher.

68th Council, 1870–1871

Carter A. Stewart, Alderman;
W. A. Freeman, Councilman, black, clerk in department;
Henry Piper, Councilman;
Benjamin M. McCoy, Councilman, light, school-teacher;
Thomas A. Gant, Councilman, light, messenger;
F. D. Gaines;
Anthony Bowen, Councilman, black, preacher.

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb 14, 1867.

[2] *Globe*, p. 2261, April 7, 1869.

[3] *The Star*, June 3; *Chronicle*, June 4 and 11, 1867.

[4] *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 3, 1867; *The Star*, May 11, 1868.

form the following year, when, although Mayor Bowen and the common council were in political accord with the dominant party at the capitol, yet the common council sought to restore to the corporation the power of issuing liquor licenses which had been transferred by the congressional law of July 23, 1866, to the police board. But the attempt went no farther, as the board of aldermen did not concur.[1] On the other hand, General Nathaniel Michler, of the army engineer corps, who had then recently replaced the civilian superintendent of buildings and grounds, set aside a city license which allowed hackmen to occupy portions of the streets in front of the principal hotels on Pennsylvania Avenue and ordered them off of that thoroughfare.[2] These instances of conflicting governmental authority gave additional force to the movement then in progress to bring about a change in the government of the District. The city election of 1867 was notable because then for the first time the negro took his place as a political equal of the white man. Otherwise it was a minor affair. It was regarded by Republicans both in and out of congress as only preliminary to the election in June of the following year. For then a mayor was to be elected. Not merely was a Democrat to be replaced by a Republican, but a Democrat who was looked upon both at the capitol and by the negroes as an enemy to the colored race.[3] Some weeks before the date of the election, the national Republican convention, recognizing the need of making a strong appeal for popular support, nominated for the presidency General U. S. Grant, the most popular man in the country. At a local Grant ratification meeting Senator James Harlan of Iowa, the chairman of the senate District committee, declared that the coming "city election would have a good effect on the elections throughout the country." [4] And so again, but for the first time since the opening of the war, national politics became a factor in Washington city elections.[5] Congress evidently accepted this view of the local contest, for a few days before the election it enacted a law which was calculated to be of help to the local Republicans in the coming contest. The section of the city charter which required city officials to have a property qualification was repealed.[1] At that time ten of the Republican members of the city council chosen at the last election were without such a qualification when elected. They retained their seats, however, on the strength of an opinion of the corporation counsel, Joseph H. Bradley, that the council having passed on their qualifications they were entitled to their seats.[2] There was another detail of the city election of 1868 that received attention in congress. It was recognized that Mayor Wallach might be given another term or that some one of similar views might be the choice. To provide for such a contingency, and further as it was estimated the Republicans would have enough representatives in both branches of the city council to have the control in joint session, congress enacted a law which took away from the mayor his chief political power by directing that the appointment of all subordinate officers be made by the council in joint session instead of by the mayor.[3] Then at the next session of congress, a Republican having been elected mayor, this power was restored to the mayor.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 30, 1868.

[2] *The Star*, March 15; *Baltimore Sun*, Aug. 16, 1867.

[3] *Globe*, p. 2261, April 7, 1868; *The Star*, Feb. 1, 1867.

[4] *National Republican*, May 16, 1868.

[5] *Intelligencer*, June 2, 1868.

The negroes, flushed with the strong showing made by their vote in 1867 and conscious of the backing of congress, changed their attitude, and before the day of the city election began to put forth their claims to at least an equal share of the offices and of the city contract work.[4] They entered the campaign united and with a candidate they had in mind for more than a year. For it was as long ago as that, the negro leaders informed Sayles J. Bowen that he was the unanimous choice of the colored people, and he had accepted the nomination.[5] Bowen's election was advocated on other than merely race grounds because, as it was expressed, "the time has come when we must have a mayor and a city government, that is to some extent, to say the least, in harmony with the federal government. . . . Such a man is Sayles J. Bowen."[1] When the Democratic nominating convention met, Mayor Wallach declined to be a candidate, giving as his reason that "the dignity, importance and usefulness of the office of mayor" had been impaired by the action of congress in taking away the power of appointing subordinate officers.[2] John T. Given, a business man of standing, was nominated, and a hotly contested campaign followed, bringing out the largest registration of whites ever made, and an unusual percentage to the polls.[3] The slight falling off in the colored registration was no doubt due to their leaving the city in search of employment, as many of them did after the election of 1867. At any rate at that time began the custom of bringing negroes to the city at election time, which later on became such a cause of scandal.[4] Such a practice was facilitated by the action of congress a few days before the election in changing the election precinct residence requirement from three months prior to the election to fifteen days.[5] While the Democrats charged their opponents with increasing the colored

---

[1] Stats., 15, 62, May 28, 1868.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, July 10 and Aug. 14, 1867.

[3] Stats., 15, 61, May 28, 1868 *Globe*, p. 3173, June 15, 1868.

[4] *Republican*, April 25, and various dates in May, 1868.

[5] *The Star*, Feb. 4, 1867.

---

[1] *Republican*, May 16, 1868.

[2] The same, May 13, 1868.

[3] The figures of the registration and voting at the 1867 election, as well as at the subsequent mayoralty election periods, are as follows:

	REGISTRATION			VOTE
	Whites	Colored	Total	
1867	9792	8212	18,004	14,049
1868	12,011	7996	20,007	18,377
1870	10,955	7535	18,490	16,983

[4] This post-election charge at this time was denied by William A. Cook, one of the Republican managers who was appointed corporation counsel by Bowen.

[5] Stats., 15, 61, May 28, 1868.

vote by importing voters, the Republicans protested against the addition to the white vote by accepting the ballots of enlisted men in the United States army, in spite of the fact that congress had been careful enough to guard against such a possibility by enacting a few days prior to the election a law forbidding it.[1]

On account of the unprecedented white vote and the falling off in the colored vote, Bowen's majority was so small that his election was at first disputed.[2] Neither party had a majority in the board of aldermen. The Bowen party controlled the common council and secured possession of the city offices in the city hall by breaking open the door of the mayor's office. Two organizations were formed in the board of aldermen; and then congress and the public witnessed with mixed feelings the ridiculous spectacle in the aldermen's chamber of the city hall of six men, headed by a presiding officer, calling themselves a legislative body, trying to drown out the voices of six other men with a presiding officer who set up precisely the same claim.[3] The situation was changed but not improved, as far as the public business was concerned, when one of the factions chose as a meeting-place the Columbian law school building on 5th Street, opposite the city hall. Three months passed before the deadlock ended. Such a display was mortifying to the dominant party in congress that had so carefully prepared the way for a partisan victory. It was discussed in both houses,[4] but without result. In addition to this exhibition of partisan futility, a short time after the aldermanic deadlock was broken, the city council passed an ordinance more than doubling the pay of the members. As the increase began at the opening of the session of the council making this provision, it anticipated the salary-grab legislation of congress.[5]

Besides the interruption to the local government business, it was pointed out that such "tomfoolery" as was seen daily in the alderman's chamber was providing another reason besides the mud and dust why congress should seek another place of residence, a reference to a recent revival of the agitation of that old-time issue.[1] Instead "of hushing the clamor for the removal of the capital," [2] as Mayor Bowen declared, at a ratification meeting following the city election, would be the effect of a Republican city victory, it was having the contrary effect. For, a little more than a week later, John A. Logan of Illinois gave notice in the house that he would offer a resolution providing for the removal of the capital from Washington.[3] This question had been broached more than a year before in the house, and in the discussion throughout the country the claims of various places, especially those of St. Louis, had been advanced. In a little more than two years after being called to the attention of congress the matter was allowed to drop, the leading St. Louis advocate declaring the time was not ripe; [4] a conclusion, as it proved, which was not lacking a substantial basis, for before that congress adjourned a majority of a house committee had not only made an adverse report, but an appropriation was provided for beginning the erection of the state, war and navy department building, the most costly that up to that time had been erected for the use of the executive branch of the government.[5] The removal agitation caused much disquiet in Washington. At the same time it served to stimulate the efforts of citizens who were advocating a change in the form of government as an essential condition in carrying out a system of city improvements that would make the city more sightly and a better place to live in.

---

[1] Stats., 15, 61, May 28, 1868; also *The Star*, May 27 and 30, 1868.

[2] *The Star*, June 2 and 8, 1868.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Aug. 15, 1868.

[4] *Globe*, p. 3118, June 2 and p. 3173, June 15, 1868.

[5] Ordinance, Feb. 6, 1869. The pay was increased from $250 per annum, the rate fixed in 1864, to $600.

In the meanwhile the Bowen administration attempted to do this work, but what it did was so largely determined by the needs of the colored voters that the results to the city were mainly an increase in the debt. While no doubt the claim of Mayor Bowen had much justification, that it was better for the public interests to have the city work done by the day under the direction of city officials rather than by contract,[1] still as he made this change apply only to the grading and gravelling of streets and not to their paving and sewerage, it was natural, under the circumstances, that the public funds were mostly spent for city work rather than contract work. As a result of such a policy, at the close of the first year 223 squares had been graded and gravelled, while only ten had been paved, and no sewers were laid.[2] The number of city employés largely increased, and it was noticed, as election day approached in June, 1869, the number of men at work on the streets was much larger than usual.[3] The action of congress in attempting to help the city by authorizing the funding of the floating debt was not of much benefit. It served to extend a credit that was not wisely used. For while almost half a million of floating debt inherited from the past was funded, before the Bowen administration ended another floating debt of nearly $900,000 had been contracted.[4] By the end of the first year citizens began to be uneasy about the city government, although that did not lead them to go to the polls and try by their votes to better things.[5] On the other hand, the supporters of the city administration went to the extent of making an assessment on local office-holders for campaign purposes.[6] As the result of the election in June, 1869, only members of the Republican party were elected to the common council, while the Democrats secured only three of the fourteen seats in the board of aldermen.[7] But it did not represent a substantial strength. The party soon began to show the usual signs of prosperity, as they quarrelled among themselves, an example which those in official position set.[8] Bowen was always the storm centre. His associates fell away from him, while he lost the confidence of the general public. As the time for the mayoralty election of June, 1870, drew near, the only issue was the elimination of Bowen.[1] And yet he had not only been zealous in providing for his political supporters, but he had been in his street work easy on the property holders, as he had done but little street paving and sewer work, the cost of which by law must be assessed on property. Also he had not insisted on uniform grades in the streets.[2] The citizens had not been called upon to spend money to change their house levels, and so he escaped a fruitful cause of antagonism and bitterness, which proved such a potent force against the board of public works that in this particular pursued an opposite course. The only friction as to street levels at this period was caused by the refusal of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co. to conform its line to that of the streets,[3] a position which was changed by court order, but only as far as the line of the new Metropolitan branch was concerned.[4] So that the tracks of its main stem continued for some years "to break the grade of every street and avenue running north and south between North Capitol Street and 10th Street east, and occupying the greater part of I Street between these limits."[5] As had been anticipated, at the city election in 1870, party lines were disregarded and a new alignment was formed, consisting only of Bowen and anti-Bowen men. The opposition united on Matthew G. Emery, a business man and a Republican. Bowen met with a crushing defeat.[6]

---

[1] *The Star*, June 8, 1868.

[2] The same, June 3, 1868.

[3] The same, June 15, 1868.

[4] *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 18, 1869.

[5] Stats., 16, 494, March 3, 1871.

---

[1] Journal, 66th Council, p. 25.

[2] The same, 67th Council, p. 79, July 19, 1869.

[3] The same, 68th Council, p. 85, July 25, 1870.

[4] The same, p. 84, July 25, 1870.

[5] *Baltimore Sun*, June 9, 1869.

[6] The same, April 16, 1869.

[7] *The Star*, June 17, 1869.

[8] *Baltimore Sun*, May 13, 31, and Sept. 27, 1869.

The administrative history of the remaining twelve months of the mayoralty form of government is of slight importance, as in its scope it was limited to about six months of that period, owing to the anticipation of the inauguration of a new government. While the debt had increased during the Bowen régime by more than a million dollars,[1] the city was still a place of mud and dust. While other cities had pavements of asphalt and wood, which were then just coming into use and were still, as it proved, in an experimental stage, the small area of paved surface in Washington was mainly of the old-time rough, wedge-shaped stone.[2] However, in 1870 the square in front of the Arlington Hotel, on the west side of Vermont Avenue between H and I streets, that had just been built by W. W. Corcoran, seven stories in height and 100 feet front,[3] was paved with asphalt, the first pavement of the sort in the city. The following year a wooden pavement took the place of the patched cobblestone surface that had done duty for two decades on Pennsylvania Avenue between the capitol and the treasury, an enterprise that was carried out by a commission appointed by congress. The cost was apportioned between the property holders, including the government, the city and the street railroad company.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 7, 1870.

[2] Board of Public Works Report, 1872, p. 4.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 21 and 23, 1868.

[4] *The Star*, March 8, 1869; *Baltimore Sun*, July 26, 1869.

[5] Commissioners' Report, 1875, p. 53.

[6] *Republican*, June 7, 1870. The vote was Emery, 10,096; Bowen, 6877. *The Star*, June 6 and 7, 1870.

---

[1] In 1867 the total debt of the city was $1,308,000. (Journal, 65th Council, p. 22.) Four years later when the mayoralty government ended it had risen to $2,966,000 (Investigation, 1872, p. 189), a per capita increase from about $14 to $27.

[2] Journal, 67th Council, p. 887, Dec. 8, 1869.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, March 22, 1869.

CHAPTER XIX

THE CITY GOVERNMENT PROBLEM

As the election of Emery as mayor in 1870 clearly established, negro suffrage legislation did not, as was the case in the south, leave the community at the mercy of the less intelligent and responsible. In addition the change in the city administration called a halt upon a policy, the most thorough Washington had ever experienced, of turning the city government into a machine for political purposes. Current abuses had stirred a civic spirit that was already aroused by the discussions going on of a change in the government, as a preliminary to carrying out a scheme of city improvements. For the passage of the District negro suffrage bill in the spring of 1867 did not stop the agitation for a change in the local government, although at the time it was charged that the main purpose of the agitators was to evade universal suffrage by doing away with popular government in the District.

Negro suffrage apart, there still remained the condition of governmental "abuses necessarily incident to many authorities and divided interests," with a neglected city as a corollary.[1] Besides, the knowledge of the expiration in May, 1868, of the twenty-year term of the city charter kept the governmental question prominent. As soon as congress met in the fall of 1867, following the first city election in which the colored people had a vote, the Morrill bill for a commission government was revived. The chairman of the senate District committee, James Harlan, introduced a measure to continue the existing municipal government. Then both the levy court and Georgetown wanted one government for the District, the former favoring a territorial form. At that time Henry D. Cooke, who had become so identified with local affairs as to be elected an alderman of Georgetown, where his spacious and hospitable home was located,[1] came out in favor of a territorial government with the governor appointed by the president, a position which, as it turned out, he was called upon to fill when that form of government was established. Those who favored a renewal of the city charter came to consent to a territorial government providing, of course, the officers and legislature were chosen by the people. It was not long before the issue became clearly defined, and there were two parties, one favoring rule by congress with practically all voting eliminated, and the other strongly advocating a continuance of what was commonly termed popular government. It was charged that mere land speculators favored the one, while only small politicians, seekers for office and ward leaders wanted the other.[2] The upholders of popular government asserted that "the depriving the people of a voice in their municipal affairs is an attempt to govern by means of a moneyed aristocracy — an anti-republican scheme."[3] As is frequently the case in opinion on public questions, the line of cleavage did not always follow that which separated the political parties. John R. Elvans was an example in point. He was a native of the District and a large dealer in hardware and building supplies. He had come into city affairs on the wave that changed the franchise conditions, but unlike some of his associates of the Republican party was a substantial citizen. He announced in the board of aldermen a conclusion, which many thoughtful observers of American city government have since reached, that universal suffrage in the management of city affairs did not work well. At the same time he was not prepared to agree with the memorial which he presented and which was signed by seventy-nine of the largest property holders representing, Mr. Elvans said, nearly one-sixth of the total assessed value of city property, that favored the exercise by congress of exclusive legislation in the District.[1] In the opinion of Mr. Elvans, congress that had just broadened the franchise in the District would not stultify itself by taking away the right of suffrage altogether. His plan was to limit the suffrage by both an educational and property qualification. But when he submitted the proposition in the form of a resolution, the board of aldermen, as was the case later on with the city council as a whole, stood out against any limitation.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 23, 1867.

---

[1] Early in 1867, Mr. Cooke purchased a large house, built by Francis Dodge at the southeast corner of 30th and Q streets, which stands to-day remodelled and enlarged into an apartment house, and which he greatly improved. (*The Chronicle*, Jan. 11, 1867.) He also purchased the Carter place of eight acres on the west side of 30th Street, between Q and R streets, but his plans to build a palatial house there were not carried out. *Baltimore Sun*, Aug. 19 and 31, 1867.

[2] *The Star*, Jan. 30, 1868.

[3] Journal, 65th Council, p. 507, Feb. 10, 1868.

That the form of government, whether a municipality or a territory, was a matter of indifference to many, both in and out of congress, as compared with the suffrage privilege, became evident as efforts were made to agree upon a plan for submission to congress. It seemed that what was really the underlying motive in the entire agitation for a change, namely, providing an effective agency for making Washington a worthy capital city, was at times lost sight of.

For while in congress there was apparent the suspicion, surviving from the long and heated contest over negro suffrage, that the District government movement was only another expression of Democratic opposition to the colored race, the introduction of the new voting element affected the views of citizens, as they considered whether it would be best to leave local affairs in the hands of the people, or transfer them to those of the general government, or have a government in which both congress and the citizens would be represented. At the outset the substantial citizens largely favored the commission form of government of the Morrill bill. Instead, however, of retaining the provision of that measure which made as the only elective offices that of comptroller and tax collector, a new plan, proposed by citizens, made those city offices appointive, but provided that the people could vote for registers of deeds and wills and justices of the peace that heretofore had been appointive places.[1]

---

[1] Journal, 65th Council, p. 475. List of signers given, Jan. 27, 1868.

But congress did not act. For in the spring of 1868 the attention of that body was not only absorbed by the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, but in addition the presidential campaign had already begun. So District affairs that had no current bearing fell into the background. For congress did not neglect at this time to extend the city charter for one year as well as to legislate rather minutely, as has been stated, so as to insure the success of the Republican city ticket, as the city election in June was looked upon as a sort of opening gun of the presidential contest of 1868. Bowen was elected, and the following fall Grant carried the national election. Then came the short session of congress in the last days of the Johnson administration, and nothing was attempted in the way of District government legislation.

Further emphasis was given to the importance of the District in national politics, as for the first time the national Republican committee appointed a subcommittee to arrange for the inaugural ceremonies, which was done by appointing a general executive committee composed of national representatives and citizens.[2] Upon the refusal of congress to allow the rotunda of the capitol to be used for the inaugural ball, the newly completed north wing of the treasury building was secured. As was the case with the patent office wing four years before, the space was so cut up by corridors and rooms that congestion could not be avoided. But that was not true of the lack of system in caring for the wraps that caused more confusion and delay and loss of property than on any previous occasion. The lowering skies and occasional showers in the early part of the day were not favorable to the street pageant, which had been arranged with great attention to detail. The feature of the parade was the political clubs.[1] On the morning of the 4th of March General Grant left his home at 205 I Street, N. W., where he had been living since the close of the war, and went as usual to the office he had occupied as commander of the army in the building at the southwest corner of 17th and F streets, N. W. President Johnson that morning went to the capitol to be on hand to sign bills in the closing hours of congress. About noon he returned to the White House, and his family having preceded him, he left it for the home on Vermont Avenue of John F. Coyle, one of the owners of the *Intelligencer*, where he remained for a couple of weeks before leaving for his home in Tennessee.[2] When the time came for the parade to start, General Grant fell in line from his headquarters and proceeded to the capitol, unattended by his predecessor, as had been the case with all the presidents except Jefferson, Jackson and Harrison. In the senate chamber the chair assigned for the use of the retiring president remained vacant, a circumstance that attracted no special comment at the time, as the quarrel between the two over the war office affair was so recent. After the ceremonies at the capitol, General Grant returned to the White House, but he did not remain there, as he and his family continued to occupy his residence for a couple of weeks while the official residence was being refitted.

---

[1] *The Star*, March 12, 1868. This was the plan prepared by the following named committee appointed at a public meeting of citizens: C. H. Nichols, W. B. Todd, H. D. Cooke, George W. Riggs, Lewis Clephane, Alexander R. Shepherd, William H. Philip, D. K. Cartter, J. M. Latta. *Baltimore Sun*, March 27, 1869; also 41st Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 24, March 20, 1869.

[2] The same, Jan. 9: *The Chronicle*, Jan. 13, 1869. The committee was as follows: Senator E. D. Morgan of New York, chairman congressional committee; Representative Robert C. Schenck of Ohio, chairman of the executive committee; General N. P. Chipman of the District and adjutant of the Grand Army of the Republic, the mayors of Washington and of Georgetown, several officers of the army, William A. Cook, chairman Republican general committee of the District, A. S. Solomon and Wm. S. Huntington of Washington and Henry D. Cooke of Georgetown.

---

[1] *The Star*, March 4, 1869.

[2] The same, March 18, 1869. After the death in 1865 of W. W. Seaton, the surviving partner of the firm of Gales and Seaton, the *Intelligencer* passed to the control of Snow, Coyle and Co. (Chauncey H. Snow and John F. Coyle). Owing to lack of support publication ceased in 1869. (*Baltimore Sun*, April 20.)

Some time before he had agreed to sell the house which had been presented to him. It became the home of General W. T. Sherman, the gift of a group of Sherman's admirers.[1]

After nearly four years of constant and irritating warfare between the White House and the capitol, they were now in accord. Legislation was no longer under the shadow of a petulant and obstinate veto power. As soon as congress met in the fall, following the inauguration, an effort was made to secure District government legislation. Then the Bowen term, futile and costly, was drawing to a close thoroughly out of harmony with the community and with the record of having accomplished but little in getting rid of Washington's blight, unpaved, unsewered streets. However, it was officials that were held responsible by much of the current public opinion, and not the system under which they were chosen, or limited municipal powers and resources. Citizens who favored the elimination of voting in the local government felt at this time that, mainly on account of the negro policy of the dominant party, it could not be made a part of any government scheme that would be approved by congress. So instead of advocating a commission form, a territorial government was proposed. At a meeting of a committee appointed at a gathering of citizens[2] A. R. Shepherd proposed a plan for a territorial form of government that embraced the essential features of the form adopted by congress a little more than a year later, except that of the board of public works, namely, a governor and an upper branch of the legislature appointed by the president and confirmed by the senate, while the lower branch as well as a delegate to congress were to be elected by the people.[3] The purpose of this blending of local and federal participation was to secure the support of the people and at the same give the general government a voice in District affairs. For, as was said, if all power is given to the people and none to congress, it was doubtful whether the bill would pass. Shepherd, the author of the plan, explained that the purpose in giving the council to the general government was to obtain the coöperation of the federal authorities. For he saw clearly then, as he demonstrated later on was true, that the city could not be made what it ought to be unless the government did its part. The important factor in the situation, the colored people and their friends, would give their approval, it was thought, if they had the right to vote for the lower branch and the delegate.[1] It was left to congress to determine its share in the District's annual budget, as no provision of that sort was made a part of the citizens' bill. But as the final form of the territorial bill makes clear, congress evaded this issue, and it is only by inference based on general statements in the bill that it may be concluded that anything of the kind was contemplated. However, in the discussion, not alone of this bill but of other District matters at this time, a few members of congress publicly recognized federal responsibility in District expenses. John Sherman of Ohio had a more intimate knowledge of District affairs than most of his colleagues, due no doubt, in part at least, to the fact that since 1866 he had owned the residence, 1321 K Street, which he occupied, a rather exceptional experience for a public man at that period. In the course of a debate in the senate he expressed the opinion that congress ought to establish some rate of taxation or some rate of contribution or appropriation for the general expenses of the District.[2] His colleague, Allen G. Thurman, asserted that the government ought to contribute to the local poor fund because there was so much public property in the District untaxed. In the house the only declaration on the subject came from William E. Niblack, the member of the Democratic national committee from Indiana, when he asserted that some system ought to be adopted by which taxable property of the District be made to contribute to the support of the public institutions of a charitable character in the District, while congress appropriated in proportion to the amount of the national property in the District.[1] At this period, as was the case later on, emphasis was placed on federal property holdings in the District and not on the federal character of the District. The territorial bill was indorsed at a public meeting of citizens and duly introduced in the senate by Hannibal Hamlin of Maine and in the house by Shelby M. Cullom of Illinois.[2] The senate alone acted. But the bill, which was passed by that body without debate, was so changed by the popular government influence that the municipalities were left intact, and in addition a territorial government was provided with general powers only,[3] an excess of governmental machinery.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 20 and March 4, 1869.

[2] The committee was composed of S. B. Brown, Dr. Harvey Lindsly, W. H. Philip, A. R. Shepherd, Hallet Kilbourn, W. B. Todd, W. H. Tenney, J. A. Magruder, Esau Pickrell and Dr. Charles H. Nichols.

[3] *The Star*, Jan. 13 and 15, 1870.

---

[1] *The Star*, Jan. 18, 1870.

[2] *Globe*, p. 844, Jan. 28, 1870.

At the next session, held in 1871, the house substituted for this measure a bill which with some changes became a month later a law and which set up in place of all existing governmental agencies, with the exception of the police and the colored school boards, a territorial government. While the new government was made "a body politic for municipal purposes," yet it had broad powers, as it was further provided "that the legislative power of the District shall extend to all rightful subjects within said District consistent with the constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act." Some years later, however, the courts decided that it was unconstitutional for congress to delegate legislative powers except for municipal purposes, and declared invalid certain laws of the legislature requiring general legislative authority.[4]

The committee was in advance of the thought of the house in proposing to establish federal and District fiscal relations by making all real and personal property of the United States in the District subject to taxation for local purposes, just as was the case with the property of individuals.[5] The house was not ready to acknowledge the obligations of the government, even as a property holder, in local affairs. The section was modified so as to provide merely for an assessment every five years by federal assessors of all government real estate except public buildings and public grounds which have been dedicated to public use as parks or squares. The result of such an assessment was to be reported to congress. But no provision was made for levying a tax or for the appropriation of money for District purposes except inferentially as to the latter, as in two sections of the law direction was given as to what was to be done by the local government in the event money was provided by congress for local purposes.

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 2733, April 15, 1870.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 3, 1870. *Globe*, pp. 855 and 3912, Jan. 28 and May 27, 1870.

[3] *The Star*, Feb. 28, 1870.

[4] MacArthur and Mackey, p. 171; also 135 U. S. 240.

[5] *Globe*, pp. 646 and 686, Jan. 24, 1871.

In one instance the board of public works was "to disburse all moneys appropriated by the United States." In the other instance, which by the way anticipated the treasury supervision feature of the existing form, the law directed that for all money appropriated by congress and intrusted to the District government to expend, semiannual accounts were to be made to the secretary of the treasury.

This indefiniteness in regard to the financial share of the general government in local expenses, although in fact congress contributed liberally, was in striking contrast to the very definite and controlling share of governmental powers. The holding back on a specific money arrangement was due in part to a feeling in congress, as well as throughout the country, that Washington looked to congress for help and neglected to help itself.[1] In addition congress had but scant conception of what it would cost to provide a city planned as Washington was with modern improvements or of the extent of the ability of the citizens to provide them. As to how much money would be needed, congress made no estimate, as it placed no limit on debt creation except the consent of a majority of the voters, as was the case under the city charter. An equal lack of knowledge of the resources of the community was manifest by making no provision for the payment of the old floating debt except from current funds. In both instances congress at the next session amended the law, placing the limit of the total indebtedness at $10,000,000 and authorizing the funding of the floating debt.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 27, 1871.

While the committee was more advanced than the house in fixing the financial relations, it fell behind the notions of that body as to restricting the participation of the people in the government. For the bill was amended by the house so as to make the upper branch of the legislature appointive instead of elective.

With this adjustment of the franchise problem and evasion of the financial problem, a direct and positive agency with ample powers was created in the board of public works for carrying out the prime purpose in changing the government, namely, the improvement of the city. For the board was not merely given entire control of the streets and sewers, but it was empowered to disburse upon its own warrant all money appropriated for such purposes by congress or the legislature or collected from property holders by assessment, as the law provided, of one-third the cost of the improvements. The section creating this board was not a part of the Shepherd bill or of the measures passed at the previous session by the senate. It was in the bill as it came from the house district committee.

While the territorial bill was broader in the grant of powers than any previous governmental law, yet it had attached to it the traditional string, showing clearly that congress in 1871 was just as tenacious lest it might part with some of its power over the District as it was in 1802 when the first city charter was granted, as well as in all subsequent legislation. At this time it took care to declare, and as experience showed did not hesitate to act, that all laws of the legislative assembly shall at all times be subject to repeal or modified by the United States and that nothing in the new law was to be so construed as "to deprive congress of the power of legislation over said District in as ample manner as if this law had not been enacted."[1] In evident recognition of this feeling, Burton C. Cook, the chairman of the house District committee, in speaking of the bill as a whole, which became a law Feb. 21, 1871, declared that its theory was to secure a proper conservative influence in the city government by the appointment of a portion of that government by authority of the United States,[1] while another speaker asserted that the aim of the bill was to provide a method of allowing the people primarily to express their wishes subject to the controlling power of congress. When the bill came to the senate, where it was passed without essential change, Hannibal Hamlin of Maine characterized the plan as an experiment. He, however, gave it his approval, mainly for the reason that he believed, as many members of both houses did, that the establishment of a local legislature with broad powers would relieve congress of attempting to enact legislation for which it has not the time.[2] Senator George F. Edmunds of Vermont declared that the bill was really designed for the preservation of national comfort and national progress as well as for the mere government of the people who live all the time in the District. It was on this occasion that, with the cutting irony of which he was master, he referred to the custom of allowing geese and hogs to roam the streets as an instance of sacrificing general to local interests.

---

[1] An instance of the exercise of such power is to be found in the law of June 10, 1872 (Stats., 17, 350), taking away from the legislature the power to grant railway charters. Two had already been granted, one for the Boundary and Silver Spring Railroad and the other for the Union Railroad along Connecticut Avenue, P Street, and through Georgetown. Leg. Assem. Laws, Part 111, Jan. 19, 1872.

Typical of District legislation in congress was the effort made by George W. Julian of Indiana to have the house strike out the word "male" in the section relating to the franchise, and equally typical was the reason advanced. He did not say the people of the District wanted it, but that "the establishment of universal male suffrage throughout the country was preceded by its establishment in the District," [3] and therefore the same course was to be followed in granting women their rights. A similar attempt was made when the negro suffrage bill was before congress,[4] and was renewed from time to time, even after the men lost the right to vote in the District.[5] The giving of political rights to the negro stimulated the activity of the advocates of women's rights, so that an association was formed in Washington a few months after District negro suffrage was secured.[1] When the national body met in Washington to bring to bear influence on congress, a prejudice against the movement and a misunderstanding of the influences behind it were created by some of the delegates, who expressed their radicalism either in speech or in dress. Several years passed before it could be said "the women with pantaloons and the men with long hair have taken the back seats at these gatherings." [2] Familiar figures in Washington were Mrs. Jane Swisshelm in her bloomer costume and Dr. Mary Walker in masculine attire. While the women sought to gain in their battle for the ballot the advantage of congressional indorsement of their cause in the District, the earnest advocates of liquor prohibition apparently did not value it as highly. However, the local workers, as was the case more than a decade before, made an appeal to congress in 1868 and asked that such a provision be inserted in the pending District government bill.[3] The Congressional Temperance Society, which, as the name implies, was composed mainly of members of congress, was influential in having the house adopt a resolution instructing the District committee to report a bill of that kind.[4] While nothing was done, yet even such inconclusive action showed an advance in the movement, for when in 1854 the city councils asked for such legislation, congress made no response, and that was the course of President Lincoln when in 1862 a similar request came to him from the Washington Total Abstinence Society. Four years later, however, congress transferred from the city officials to the board of police commissioners the power of issuing liquor licenses,[5] and while the purpose may have been to limit the traffic, it did not have that effect, at least until some three years later, when Grant came to the presidency and his appointment of members of the police board proved to be men in favor of restricting the traffic.[1] Then the number of liquor licenses was cut in half, but still that left one liquor place in the city to every 500 of the population.[2] The temperance people endeavored to have enforced the Sunday closing law, which had apparently been largely disregarded since the opening of the war.[3] The general cause had active advocates in men and women prominent in the social life of the city. At the opening of the year 1869 it is mentioned, as a rather unusual occurrence on such an occasion, that at the New Year's reception of Vice-President Colfax no liquor was served,[4] while a year later it was found that "places where liquor was offered to New Year callers were exceptional."[5] By that time the observance of the custom of making New Year calls, which had been revived just as the war came to a close,[6] had begun to reach the proportions of almost a general observance. In 1872 more than 400 ladies received.[7] The reaction in business and financial conditions from the inflation of the war continued nearly through the Johnson administration, and that had an influence on social affairs. However, much of the simplicity of earlier times continued even into the Grant administration, when the family dinner hour at the White House continued to be five o'clock, just as was the case during the preceding administration.[8] Besides the strained political relations of the president and congress, the Johnson social régime had the further handicap of a White House mistress who was obliged, on account of delicate health, to live almost the life of a recluse. The social duties devolved upon her daughters, Mrs. Stover, a widow, and Mrs. Daniel T. Patterson, the latter the wife of the senator from Tennessee. Beyond the functions usual during the season of afternoon and evening receptions and state dinners the social life at the White House was uneventful.[1] Unlike his predecessors from the time of Van Buren, President Johnson did not leave the White House in the summer to live in the country,[2] but that circumstance had nothing to do with the advocacy in congress of a plan to erect a residence for the president beyond the limits of the city and use the White House exclusively for his office. For when that came up in the senate in the early part of 1866, the quarrel between the president and congress had just begun. It is quite apparent that while the advocates of a public park for Washington, first proposed at this time, realized the unusual beauty and advantage of the Rock Creek Valley for such a purpose, they further appreciated that it would be given a more practical turn, at least in the eyes of the American nation, as up to that period New York was the only city that had made such a provision, although Chicago had just taken steps to acquire land for park purposes, if it was designed to provide within its limits a site for a presidential residence. However, both projects, while the subject of an elaborate report from the engineer officer in charge of public buildings and grounds,[3] soon dropped out of sight. From time to time, however, attention was called to this subject. Finally, in November, 1888, through the initiative of Charles C. Glover, a citizens' movement was started that ended only when the park was acquired.[4] President Johnson followed the custom of entertaining senators and representatives in alphabetical order, and while only thirty-six could be seated at the table in the state dining-room, apparently the round was completed before the end of the season.[5] But when Grant came, the wives of senators and members were also invited to the state dinners, and

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 639, Jan. 20, 1871.

[2] The same, p. 685.

[3] The same, p. 646, Jan. 20, 1871.

[4] *Baltimore Sun*, Jan. 15, 1867.

[5] 44th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 40, Jan. 25, 1876.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, July 8 and Sept. 3, 1867.

[2] The Olivia Letters, p. 250, Jan. 13, 1871.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 21 and Nov. 21, 1868.

[4] The same, Feb. 22, 1867.

[5] Stats., 14, 213, July 23, 1866.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, June 5, 1869. The members of the board were D. F. Hamlink, C. H. Cragin, A. De V. Burr, W. H. Chase and W. H. Murtagh. District of Columbia Police, p. 59.

[2] *The Star*, July 23, 1868, and Jan. 4, 1870.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 28, 1872.

[4] The same, Jan. 2, 1869.

[5] The same, Jan. 3, 1870.

[6] *The Star*, Jan. 1, 1865. Black and White, H. Latham, p. 52.

[7] *Baltimore Sun*, Jan. 1.

[8] Reminiscences, Poore, Vol. 2, pp. 194 and 259.

---

[1] What was spoken of at the time as unusual was a children's party for the president's grand-children for which 300 invitations were issued and at which dancing was a feature. *Intelligencer*, Dec. 30, 1868.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Aug. 25, 1868.

[3] 39th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 21, Jan. 29, 1867.

[4] *The Star*, Feb. 27, 1892.

[5] The same, Feb. 6, 1867.

as the dining table was no larger, the making out of the list of guests was changed from a mechanical task to one requiring tact as well as knowledge of current politics.[1] However, Grant was not dismayed by possible complications in inviting some from the congressional list and leaving out others. He was independent in that particular, as he was in ignoring the old custom that forbade a president from accepting social invitations.[2] In addition Mrs. Grant inaugurated a new custom in having the ladies of the cabinet or wives of senators receive with her at her weekly afternoon receptions.[3] The growing importance of social life was emphasized early in the Grant administration by a revival of questions of social precedence, this time the provoking cause being the claim made by senators of precedence over members of the Supreme Court.[4] The social circle became so large that the ladies of the cabinet decided that it would be physically impossible to return calls, and the wives of senators were inclined to adopt the same course.[5] The influence of the changed conditions was manifest before Grant took office. For while he was a resident of the city, commander-in-chief of the army, he gave up the practice of sending out cards for receptions at his I Street residence, because he found that more than half of the people who attended had not been invited. What was still more unpleasant, some of these uninvited guests "lost sight of the fact that they were in a private house when the came near the refreshment table." It was not alone at General Grant's that this undesirable element appeared, but also at the receptions of President Johnson, where their rough behavior was a cause of annoyance and discomfort. In addition to hustling their way through the crowded rooms, they also cut the furniture coverings and the window hangings so that it became necessary to station policemen at each window in the east room to prevent such depredations.[6] The furnishings of the White House were of the period and practically renewed once every four years. At the beginning of the

---

[1] Olivia Letters, p. 199.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 2, 1870.

[3] Olivia Letters, p. 179.

[4] The same, p. 179.

[5] The same, p. 280.

[6] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 13 and 22, 1867.

Johnson administration the wear and tear of the war period was remedied by a refitting and redecorating of the interior. The color scheme was continued for the two rooms on each side of the blue room, which are still known as the red and green rooms, as they had been for more than a decade.[1] The stable which stood between the White House and the treasury, and which was destroyed by fire in 1864, had been replaced by the erection of a building to the southwest near 17th Street. As soon as General Grant became president the stable was enlarged to provide space for the string of fast horses which was one of the passions of the great military leader. In addition to such a sporting adjunct of the White House, a further worldly frivolity, as it was at one time regarded, if not something worse, was the fitting up in the White House of a billiard room and placing there a billiard table at the expense of the government.[2] The president was not attacked for using a gambling implement as John Quincy Adams was, although the latter paid for the billiard table. Another innovation was the provision made by congress at the beginning of the Grant administration for a house steward,[3] but it was not to provide an official who would be responsible for the plate and the furniture, as was the case when such an office was created in 1857 at the beginning of Buchanan's term. As a newspaper society writer of that day declared, the duty of the White House steward was to supervise the housekeeping, something that "heretofore the ladies of the White House have looked after."[4] Apparently President Buchanan did not avail himself of this opportunity to have a household steward at government expense; at least no further provision was made for the salary. This legislation of 1857 was in continuance of a more liberal policy on the part of congress in relieving the president of some of the expenses of his position. For two years before congress began to provide the fuel, as it had a few years previously the lighting, as well as a doorkeeper and an assistant doorkeeper. So that six years before the war the president's housekeeping expenses, with the important exceptions of paying the wages of the servants and providing and maintaining his equipages, were as they are to-day confined to supplying his family table and defraying the cost of entertaining. President Grant confessed after four years' experience that his salary of $25,000 did "not defray the expenses of the executive for one year,"[1] so that he welcomed the advance to $50,000 which was made at the close of his first term. While this provision was a part of what became known as the "salary-grab bill," yet public indignation was aroused, not by the increase in the president's salary, but that congress had voted itself back pay. Grant made no change in the practice of long standing of having as his aide on social occasions the marshal of the District. He was the more inclined to continue this custom, as he had appointed his brother-in-law, A. R. Sharpe, to succeed D. S. Gooding of Indiana, who served during the Johnson administration. The usual round of White House social events was notably varied when the president's only daughter, Nellie, as she was popularly known, was married to Charles Frederic Sartoris, an Englishman. The bride, attended by eight bridesmaids and in the presence of a distinguished company, was married in the east room.[2]

---

[1] *The Chronicle*, Jan. 2, 1867. Gail Hamilton, p. 187.

[2] Report Public Buildings and Grounds for 1869.

[3] Stats., 15, 287, March 3, 1869.

[4] Olivia Letters, p. 197.

Before the close of the first four years of the Grant régime there were "indications of a passion for notoriety [in social affairs] to be won by prodigal display." Then the doings in the social world became a distinct department in the newspapers, second in interest only to politics.[3] As the masculine pen balked or ran heavily as well as clumsily in descriptions of fashionable gowns, the woman society reporter made her appearance.[4] But with rare exceptions the women did not go outside of this field into the wider domain of political and current comment. This remained man's work. The extent to which the newspapers of the country maintained correspondents at the political centre may perhaps be somewhat gauged by the formation, two years after the war, of the Washington Correspondents' Club, with an active membership of twenty-five.[1] While, as stated in the constitution, the purpose was "to secure the advantages of organization and for the cultivation of fraternal sentiment," the chief function, during the several years the club lived, was apparently an annual dinner where their friends were entertained. The revival in business throughout the country which began in 1868 and the great material development that followed, especially the railroad building that preceded the panic of 1873, had an influence on all phases of life in Washington.

---

[1] Messages, Richardson, 7, 380.

[2] *The Star*, May 21, 1874.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 5, 1872.

[4] Olivia Letters, p. 197. Miss Augustine Snead was the first woman Washington correspondent. Recollections of a Correspondent, Francis A. Richardson, Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 6, p. 36.

The election of Grant in 1868 was looked upon as the beginning of an era of peace when the bitterness of the war and of the reconstruction period would disappear. An augury of the promised change was the action of Grant, a few weeks after his inauguration, in doing away with the military guard which had been on duty about the White House since the assassination of Lincoln.[2] The expansion of the social life, especially in the style of living, requiring larger and more permanent residences, affected favorably local conditions. For at the close of the war the temporary character of the connection with the city of many prominent in its social and official life gave an English visitor the impression that the city was only "a large and not very convenient hotel."[1] Still, as it proved, the war had only interrupted the change in living methods begun in the decade just before, so that more and more members of the senate and of the house, and especially the former, owned the homes they occupied.[2] Besides there was an increase in the number of people who chose Washington as their home. A year after the war building began to be active,[3] and increased in volume until checked by the general prostration of business due to the panic of 1873. A large section of the northern city area was still inclosed and under cultivation, as the streets existed only on paper. In addition, owing to lack of natural drainage, some portions were swampy, a condition suggestive of the earlier days when the great stretch north of H Street and west of 10th Street was known as the slashes. So extensive was this unbuilt area that in spite of the five years of a rather steady pushing northward of building improvements, as late as 1871 the building erected for the Washington City Orphan Asylum at the northwest corner of 14th and S streets, and occupied as soon as it was finished in 1866 by the state department, was described as "a suburban building."[4] This phrase was used in an account of the meeting there of the distinguished group of men that constituted the High Joint Commission to consider the Alabama claims and other differences between the United States and Great Britain growing out of the civil war.[5]

---

[1] Constitution and by-laws of the Washington Correspondents' Club, Washington, 1867. Also the *Star*, March 7, 1867. The active members were George W. Adams, *New York World;* Edwin L. Andrews, *New Orleans Crescent;* Martin W. Barr, Southern Associated Press; David W. Bartlett, *New York Evening Post;* Henry V. N. Boynton, *Cincinnati Gazette;* Edward P. Brooks, *New Orleans Republican;* Ira N. Burritt, Western Republican Press Office; Thomas M. Cook, *Chicago Times;* Lorenzo L. Crounse, *New York Times;* Robert K. Elliot, *New York Express;* Walton J. Fitch, *Boston Post;* Lawrence A. Gobright, New York Associated Press; James G. Holland, New York Associated Press; Oscar K. Harris, *National Intelligencer;* Joseph MacFarland, *Washington Chronicle;* Joseph B. McCullagh, *Cincinnati Commercial;* Crosby S. Noyes, *Washington Star;* Uriah H. Painter, *Philadelphia Inquirer;* Ben. Perley Poore, *Boston Journal;* Hiram J. Ramsdell, *New York Tribune;* Frank A. Richardson, *Baltimore Sun;* William P. Seville, *New York Herald;* William B. Shaw, *Boston Transcript;* William W. Warden, *Philadelphia Ledger;* James S. Young, *New York Tribune.*

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, March 20, 1869.

As one result of the building activity an entirely new residence section was developed in the locality between M and S streets and 7th and 14th streets, where a number of citizens who up to that time had their homes near the business centre built houses for their own use.[1] A beginning of house building was made in the section east of the capitol, where Captain A. Grant made what proved to be a too ambitious start by building up the frontage of the entire square on the south side of East Capitol Street between 2d and 3d streets with a class of houses expensive and elaborate for that day.[2] While other improvements followed in that locality,[3] still the hopes of the property owners that the tide of new house owners would be diverted in that direction were but partially realized, although the largest builder of that period, Alexander R. Shepherd, located one of his operations in that section.[4] The vicinity of the goverment printing-office began to show at this period evidence of its importance as a centre by an increase in the number of houses.[5]

---

[1] Frasers', September, 1866, p. 327.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Jan. 30, 1868.

[3] The same, Jan. 10, 1867, and June 25, 1868.

[4] Olivia Letters, p. 280.

[5] The English members occupied as their residence the house of W. H. Philip on K Street, between 12th and 13th streets, "one of the largest and finest private houses in the city."

The building up of vacant ground away from the centre was greatly aided by Bowen's policy of providing public work for his constituents. For in doing so he opened and graded streets all the way out to the city bounds, thus changing the old-time conditions of great stretches of land, unimproved largely because they were inaccessible. One of the phases of this period of an active building market was the renewal of the agitation for an eight-hour working day. Some six months after peace a labor demonstration took the form of a torchlight parade.[6] But three years passed before congress adopted the eight-hour day for all laborers, workmen and mechanics in government employ.[7] That did not affect the practice in private employment. While labor had its organization in the Workingmen's Assembly,[8] the master mechanics of the city had theirs,[9] and then some months later a builders' exchange was formed.[1] The building regulations were vague and defective, and there was no city official whose distinctive duty was to see that the law was enforced. Rows of brick houses were built with party walls of four inches,[2] while in a large area of the city there was no restriction on frame construction.[3]

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, July 29, 1867.

[2] The same, July 3 and 8, 1867.

[3] The same, April 29, 1869.

[4] The same, Sept. 10, 1867.

[5] The same, Sept. 10, 1867.

[6] *Chronicle*, Nov. 2, 1865.

[7] Stats., 15, 77, June 25, 1868.

[8] *Baltimore Sun*, August 23, 1867.

[9] The same, Jan. 29, 1867. The officers were president Thomas B. Entwistle; First vice-president, James Davis; second vice-president, George W. Henderson; secretary, Augustus Davis; treasurer, Wilson E. Brown. Apparently this was not the first organization, as the meeting was held in the room of the Builders' Exchange.

A measure, if not exactly of the enlarged means of the people, yet certainly of the enlarged notion of community needs as well as of its prospects, was the launching in 1867 of two enterprises. One was the erection of a Y. M. C. A. building at the northwest corner of 9th and D streets, N. W., and the other a Masonic temple at the northwest corner of 9th and F streets, N. W. While both structures were erected at a total cost of nearly $150,000 in each instance, yet both were embarrassed by debt, although the meeting of the Y. M. C. A. trustees, when the building project was decided upon, was held, owing to the interest manifested by Henry D. Cooke, in the office of Jay Cooke and Co.; Chief Justice Chase presided.[4] When this period of city growth began, in 1866, the limit of the built-up section to the north was N Street, while the broad plateau to the east of the capitol was for the most part a stretch of commons, and in South Washington the streets were not graded.[5] A high bluff still shut off the river front, with only 7th and 11th streets opened through. As the result of the street grading the bluff disappeared, a sidewalk was laid along the east side of Water Street and 9th Street was opened through to the water.[6] Until shortly after 1870 Hopkin's brickyard blocked the course of Massachusetts Avenue just west of Dupont Circle. The only street-car line that went to the city bounds at Florida Avenue was the one on 7th Street.[1]

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 23, 1867. The officers were president S. D. Castleman; vice-president, W. McCullum; secretary, Frederick D. Stuart.

[2] Report Board of Public Works, 1872, p. 95.

[3] In 1874 (commissioners' report for that year, p. 17) the fire limits were extended to B Street south, North Carolina Avenue, Massachusetts Avenue, North Capitol Street and thence along Q Street except in the case of small sections where the limits went to Florida Avenue.

[4] *The Star*, May 4, 1867.

[5] Investigation, 1872, p. 640.

[6] *The Star*, Dec. 15, 1869.

Up to 1869, apparently congress, which granted a charter, as well as the citizens who asked for a steam railroad to start from the Aqueduct Bridge and to pass through the streets of Georgetown and along S, T or U streets, crossing the Baltimore and Ohio tracks and thence east of the capitol to the river, had no expectation that a region so remote from the heart of the city would be built up in the near future if ever. For otherwise it could not be understood how a community that was complaining about surface tracks in the vicinity of the depot and in South Washington would make no protest against such legislation.[2] However, the road was not built, evidently because the entrance of the southern lines into the city was not shifted, as was advocated, from the Long Bridge to the Aqueduct Bridge.[3] As was noted in an earlier period, so at this time, although building space was abundant within the urban limits, yet land outside was subdivided into building lots and placed on the market. At the outset of this period of city development the acreage property extending along the northern bounds of the city from 15th to 17th streets and known as Meridian Hill was laid off into building sites and eagerly purchased at auction at from ten to twenty cents per square foot.[4] As it proved, the purchasers were largely speculators or investment seekers rather than home builders. This was not the case to the same extent with the subdivision of Mount Pleasant at 14th Street and Park Road that had been laid out in the fall of 1865 as well as of the tract immediately adjoining on the south of Park Road that was subdivided about the same time by Senator John Sherman and his brother, General William T. Sherman. Another influence noted in this general locality was the erection two years later of a building for Howard University at the head of 7th Street. In the immediate vicinity General O. O. Howard and several others who were interested in the freedmen erected houses for their own use. Farther to the north and on the same side of Georgia Avenue, in the year 1866, the Washington Schutzen Verein began to hold annual festivals, and in a few years purchased a tract of land on the east side of Georgia Avenue between Hobart and Kenyon streets, that became known as the Schutsen Park.[1] An attempt was made to begin suburban development in another direction, as in 1869 those interested in the Alexandria Canal Aqueduct, at that time just changed into a toll-bridge, purchased an estate known as Rosslyn at the Virginia end of the bridge and laid it out in town lots, expecting the bridge would become a part of the main railway connection to the south as well as the centre of travel and traffic between the District and Virginia.[2] In this period of city development Horace Greeley, in the course of some characteristic advice to government clerks who complained of the smallness of their pay, told them that if they could not live in Washington on what they earned, then they should go to Kansas or Nebraska instead of beseeching congress to give larger salaries. Besides, he added: "Washington is not a nice place to live in. The rents are high, the food is bad, the dust is disgusting, the mud is deep and the morals are deplorable." [3]

---

[1] The northern terminus of the 9th Street line was at M Street, while that of the 14th Street line was at S Street. At this period, in spite of protests from citizens, both the Washington and Georgetown Co. and the Metropolitan Co. adopted the device in use elsewhere of one-horse conductorless cars in order to reduce expenses. *Baltimore Sun*, Aug. 16 and Oct. 28, 1867.

[2] Stats., 16, 3, March 29, 1869.

[3] A board of directors was elected consisting of J. L. Kidwell, J. W. Thompson, H. D. Cooke, James A. Magruder. Hallet Kilbourn, A. R. Shepherd, W. S. Hungtington, Moses Kelly and W. B. Todd. One hundred thousand dollars was paid on the stock in cash, 20 per cent of the capital stock as the charter required. *Baltimore Sun*, July 29, 1869.

[4] The same, Oct. 25, 1867.

Two years later, and within six months of the close of the Bowen administration, William M. Stewart of Nevada, in the senate, opposed granting the earnest request of citizens, backed by a subscription of large size,[4] for authority to levy a special tax to pay a portion of the expenses of a world's fair to be held in Washington in 1871. He did not think that Washington was the place to hold such an exhibition. "None of us are proud of this place," he added. He said he did not want to invite the world to see the town with its want of railroads and its muddy streets. The town "is nicely located," he observed, "and with plenty of money and a little enterprise it might be made a city, but let us have a city before we invite anybody to see it."[1] To provide Washington with the improvements and conveniences regarded as essential in community life of that day was the main purpose which the new form of government provided by congress in 1871 was designed to accomplish. Within three weeks after signing the act, President Grant, who was in full sympathy with such a purpose, appointed a governor, a secretary, a board of public works of four members, the governor being ex officio a member and also the president, a council of eleven members, the upper body of the legislature and a board of health. Then followed the choice by popular election of a delegate to congress and twenty-one members of the house of delegates, the second body of the legislature. The new government was organized, and the legislature convened some two days prior to June 1, the date fixed when the existing mayoralty government was to go out of existence.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Aug. 6, 1867. An account of the second annual Schutzen Verein.

[2] *The Star*, Jan. 1, 1869.

[3] The same, Dec. 14, 1867.

[4] The same, Nov. 25, 1869, and Jan. 17, 1870.

By the time the people were called upon to do their part in organizing the government, a difference of opinion had begun to develop. This was not because of the colored question, for that was unchanged,[2] although later on, when the extensive public work began, it took on a new phase, as the colored vote then practically became the labor vote with interests identified with white labor. Nor was the divergence along the familiar party lines, for the appointments of the president, the influence of congress and the solidarity of the colored or labor vote assured the continued supremacy in local affairs of the Republican party. But what divided the community into two factions at the very outset was the extent and character of the public expenditures. For on the day of the first election, held in April, in compliance with the new law, apprehension was expressed that the policy of the government about to be established would renew the Bowen system of large and extravagant expenditures.[1]

---

[1] *Globe*, p. 304, Dec. 22, 1869.

[2] This is shown by the representation, proportionately about the same as in the mayoralty government, secured by the race in the legislative assembly, which was as follows: —

First Legislative Assembly

Council

Frederick Douglass, light, lecturer;
John A. Gray, light, caterer;
Adolphus Hall, light, miller;
Lewis H. Douglas, light, clerk in department.

House of Delegates

Solomon G. Brown, black, messenger;
James A. Handy, black, preacher.

Second Legislative Assembly

Council

Same.

House of Delegates

Solomon G. Brown;
O. S. B. Wall, light, lawyer;
Henry Piper, light, messenger.

Third Legislative Assembly

Council

John H. Brooks, light, clerk;
Adolphus Hall.

House of Delegates

Solomon G. Brown;
O. S. B. Wall;
Thomas W. Chase, black, contractor;
J. W. Taliaferro, light, messenger;
Sidney W. Herbert, light, doorkeeper.

Fourth Legislative Assembly

No change in council.

House of Delegates

Joseph Brooks, light, farmer;
Albert H. Underwood, light, hack driver.
The personal details were furnished by Dr. William Tindall.

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, April 20, 1871.

This early expression of the opposition that fought the new government from the beginning to the end represented largely at that juncture the attitude of some citizens, important in property but not in numbers, in a community that had never directly authorized going beyond the current revenues for street improvements. As will be recalled when in 1864 a beginning was made to provide city improvements, while the city charter permitted a bond issue, provided the people by vote consented, yet their consent was not asked nor was it formally proposed to do so, which shows that Shepherd's opinion was not shared to any extent by his fellow-citizens; for he declared, later on, that during the mayoralty government he "urged the adoption of the plan of borrowing sufficient money to improve the city and make it a decent place to live in and not put the whole tax upon the present generation."[1] Then, as was the case seven years later, while the financial condition of citizens had improved, yet the District was still a community of limited means. Naturally under such circumstances the scope of public work, proposed by a city council, representative of its constituency, was limited. The shrinking of property holders from increased taxation was aggravated by the seeming unfailing hopefulness that somehow city improvements would come through congress. Only two years prior to the change in government the prospect of securing the paving of Pennsylvania Avenue, which was in such a bad condition that business was leaving it, was for a time threatened. For congress did not undertake to pay, as it did two decades before, the entire cost. But it did provide for the payment of the proportionate share of abutting public property, while private property was to bear its share. The reluctant citizens felt that if they stood out and the bill failed, then the entire work might be done at public cost.[2] Now, however, the citizens were brought face to face with a prospect of general city improvements on a large scale and with no assurance, as far as any provision of law was concerned, that the general government would even continue the practice of paying its share of the cost of city work in front of public property. At the same time the new law bore less heavily on individual taxpayers than the prevailing practice up to this time in Washington and in American towns generally; as instead of the entire cost being met by a front-foot tax, only one third was to be assessed.

---

[1] Investigation, 1872, p. 397.

[2] *The Star*, Feb. 9. 1869.

But it was not so much the law that gave rise to this early apprehension as the men whom the president appointed to administer it, or rather the man; for from the outset, Alexander R. Shepherd dominated the new government. It was not a new function, but only a new part, as for seven years past he had been the leader of citizens who wanted to better city conditions. He was not, however, the official head of the new government, as Henry D. Cooke had been appointed governor and was also ex officio a member and president of the board of public works. Shepherd was only one of five members composing the board, yet when the board organized, he was made vice-president and executive officer, and thereafter, as the sequel showed, meetings were not regularly held, and the acts of Shepherd were recorded as the acts of the board.[1] In placing Shepherd at the head, all the members of the board, with the exception of A. B. Mullett, the supervising architect of the treasury department, were only continuing the relation they had with him for several years past in civic efforts. For S. B. Brown, a government contractor and, following the war, also an extensive builder, James A. Magruder, who had been an engineer in the army,[2] and Henry D. Cooke had been associated with him in the various citizens' movements for a better city. The organization as well as the personnel of the board was sufficient to convince citizens that public money was to be spent in liberal fashion. They foresaw heavier taxation and shrank from it. They also distrusted the soundness of Shepherd's business methods. During the four years previous to his appointment he had gone outside of his regular business and had been building houses for sale. He was known as a bold operator. When other men built one row or perhaps one or two houses, Shepherd built rows of houses. This experience served to confirm him in the conviction that the great need of the city was "some permanent system of improvements." [1] His operations, however, were of such an extensive character that he was heavily involved in debt, so when he entered the new government, while the assessed value of his property was about $200,000, three-fourths of it was encumbered.[2] Shepherd believed in debt, as all progressive business men do. He was sound enough in the principle.[3] His application struck careful men as imprudent if not reckless. This early impression proved correct, both as to his public and personal affairs. Although he came to be spoken of as Boss Shepherd, he was not the type of city political boss who is in the public service for private gain, as was the case with Tweed as he stood revealed to the shocked gaze of the country only a few months after the new District government was under way. On the contrary, Shepherd stood before the community as a man "who had never been known to cheat or steal," [4] and this record remained unchanged. His large way of doing things was part of the nature of the man. He was a big man physically. His imperious will recognized not merely no master, but no difficulty that stood in the way of what he wanted to do. Frequently, not even the law, as his practice was to do the thing and, if need be, see about the law afterwards. He was a free liver and a free spender, a man with strong passions and appetites, which he at times indulged but did not allow to get the control. Like all virile, individual natures whose faults and virtues are alike on the surface, Shepherd had devoted friends as well as bitter enemies, and there was hardly a middle class. Grant liked Cooke because he was a banker and rich. He also liked the capable Shepherd with his bluff, hearty nature, and these instances are typical of men Grant was inclined to.[5]

---

[1] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, p. x, and Vol. 3, p. 2319. *The Nation*, 18, 406, June 25, 1874.

[2] Investigation, 1872, p. 580.

---

[1] Investigation, 1872, p. 735.

[2] The same, p. 425.

[3] The same, p. 396.

[4] *The Nation*, 18, 406, June 25, 1874.

[5] Rhodes, 6, 377 and 383.

With a man of Shepherd's dynamic force in a position of authority the public did not have long to wait for things to happen. Only a few days after the board of public works was appointed injunction proceedings were begun at its instance, which were successful in stopping the corporate government, of which Shepherd as a member of the board of aldermen was a part, from making further contracts for street work.[1] After taking steps to guard against a heritage of unfinished street contracts and leaving the existing government to mark time, as far as its most important function was concerned, for the several months remaining of its life, the new ruler stirred afresh the apprehension of citizens who feared extravagance by the elaborate provision for housing the new government and the gorgeousness of the furnishings.[2] For in addition to leasing three buildings, two for the executive department and one for the legislative,[3] a force of employés was appointed that was four times as large as under the corporation governments, although the Washington city government in the last year of its existence was criticised because ten per cent of the city's budget was required for salaries.[4] While subsequently the force was reduced, yet this circumstance served to confirm and extend the impression of careless profuseness, that had further confirmation when $57,000 was spent in remodelling and furnishing the building leased for the board of public works and the District offices.[5] As a contrast to such an expenditure it is interesting to note that only a little less than two years later, congress, by the purchase of the District interest in the city hall, provided a sum not to exceed $75,000 for the erection of a building for the entire government except the legislature.

---

[1] Investigation, 1872, p. 13.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, July 28 and Aug. 1, 1871.

[3] The governor's office was in the building 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, while the board of public works and the territorial offices were in the buildings 214 and 216 John Marshall Place. The concert room on the second floor of the Metzerott building, 919–921 Pennsylvania Avenue, was rented for the house of delegates and the upper floor for the council.

[4] Investigation, 1872, p. 363. Journal of the 68th Council, p. 161.

[5] The same, pp. 248 and 522.

After arranging with the Washington Market Co., as the law provided,[1] for the portion of Centre Market Square fronting on Pennsylvania Avenue, which was done without the use of ready cash, in lieu of which the District legislature reduced the market company's annual contribution to the poor fund from $25,000 to $7500,[2] a slight beginning was made in the erection of a District building, which was stopped, and as it proved permanently, by the investigation of 1874.[3] In contrast to these evidences of carelessness and profusion in administration was an alert and efficient political policy. Attention was given to the first election for members of the house of delegates, for it was important to have the legislature in harmony, as the operations of the board of public works were largely dependent on its money and credit grants, especially the latter. As the appointments of members of the council by the president were political, the upper body could be relied upon. So the device familiar in city elections, for several years past, of importing voters from the near-by counties of Maryland and Virginia was not neglected.[4] Nor was the influence of the national administration withheld. On the other hand, the local Democratic party made most determined efforts. At no subsequent election was such a large vote polled. The Republicans, standing for a liberal city improvement policy, elected two-thirds of the members of the house of delegates. The Democratic candidate for delegate to congress, Richard T. Merrick, a leading member of the bar, was defeated by General Norton P. Chipman. The latter, as was the case with Henry D. Cooke, was, so to speak, the representative in the new government of national interests. For while both were residents of the District, yet that was mainly because of wider associations and connections.

General Chipman had left his law practice in Iowa to go into the army as a private, and rose to be brigadier-general. He served under Grant at Fort Donelson. At the close of the war he opened a law office in Washington and was at once employed by the government in the trial of Wirz, who was in charge of the war prison camp at Andersonville. He was prominent in the Grand Army and as adjutant-general was associated with General John A. Logan, the commander-in-chief and then a member of the house. A man of striking personal appearance, and an effective public speaker,[1] General Chipman had also an acquaintance with public men, qualities and attainments which were of value in his new position; especially as the delegate from the District, like those from the territories, could take part in the proceedings of the house but had no vote.

---

[1] Stats., 17, 540, March 3, 1873.

[2] Journal, House of Delegates, Vol. 5, p. 110.

[3] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 3, p. 1860.

[4] *Baltimore Sun*, April 19, 1871.

The president did not overlook General Chipman when, before the election was held, he selected the officers of the District, for he made him secretary of the territory.[2] He also recognized another national figure, as he appointed Frederick Douglass a member of the council. But when the District nominating convention met, both Chipman and Douglass were put in nomination for delegate. Chipman was chosen. At that time Douglass had just become a resident of the District, where he had come to take charge of the *New National Era*, a weekly newspaper which he started in 1870 as an organ of the race. This purpose was implied in the revival of the name of the famous antislavery national organ.[3] Autocratic as the new government proved to be, both in its spirit and methods, it continued to be sustained by the vote of the people. To a large extent, no doubt, this was a bread-and-butter loyalty to the source of jobs. But that was only one element in the power of the government. For both in city affairs and in the relations with the District's overlord, congress, political sagacity and expediency were displayed. Factional and race interests,[1] as well no doubt as the constituents of members of congress, were recognized in filling the offices which the legislature so lavishly provided. For as was declared at the time, "when the question of public improvement was under discussion, the people of Washington were told that they were like the citizens of other towns and must pay the bills. But when any local office was vacant, they were told that Washington was the seat of government and that the politicians all over the country were equally entitled with the residents to share in its official plunder."[2]

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, March 30, 1871.

[2] In place of General Chipman the president appointed as secretary, Edward L. Stanton, a member of the District bar and a son of the great war secretary.

[3] At first Rev. Stella Martin, the pastor of the Fifteenth Street Presbyterian Church, was editor. (*Baltimore Sun*, Jan. 15 and 21, 1870.) But Douglass' name appeared as corresponding editor, just as was the case with the name of the poet Whittier in the *National Era*. The *New National Era* lived only about three years.

"The board of public works when they entered upon their duties," Shepherd told the congressional investigating committee soon after the new government was started, "concluded that they had been created for something or nothing, and if for anything, it was to devise and carry out as rapidly as possible some system of improvements, in order that in this respect the capital of the nation might not remain a quarter of a century behind the times."[3] In less than a month after the legislature met, the board of public works laid before that body a plan for a system of improvements. To use the phrase of the board it was "a comprehensive plan."[4] But it had more than mere scope, although in that particular it exceeded anything of the kind ever undertaken at one time in any city in the world, with the possible exception of Paris in the days of the second empire, a decade before the opening of the civil war.

For this plan provided for a sewerage system that would also care for the drainage and uniform street levels, both of which were so well devised for the needs of a large centre that they remain the foundation of the city to-day. In still another respect the plan proved enduring, for in reducing the broad thoroughfares to a practicable width for paving, the admirable device was adopted of a parking space between the building line and the sidewalk in residence streets. With a breadth of vision unknown in that day in city improvement work, tree planting was made an essential part of the plan, and unlike a great deal of the street paving and sewer work, it was well done. The board had the wisdom to select as members of the parking commission men of expert knowledge.[1] Liberal bounds were given to what was described as the central section of the city, where every street was to be improved. It lay, broadly speaking, between the Mall and P Street and New Jersey Avenue and New Hampshire Avenue. In addition the main thoroughfares in all sections extending to the urban bounds were included in the area of improvements as well as connecting county roads.[2] The District had just acquired by purchase the rights of the two moribund turnpike companies controlling Georgia Avenue and the section of the old Baltimore Pike from Bladensburg to the city bounds. So they were included as well as made free.[3] In all one hundred and eighteen miles of city streets were improved and thirty-nine miles of county roads.[4] It is not surprising that the undertaking was spoken of as "prodigal" and as "far in excess of local needs, and solely, as far as local motives are concerned, to make the city worthy of the Nation." [5] To some property holders the cost, even on the basis of the board's estimate, which proved to be totally inadequate, appeared to threaten ruin if not confiscation. For the board placed the cost at about six and a quarter million dollars. As under the law one-third was to be paid by a special assessment on the abutting property, a bond issue of four million was asked, which the legislature promptly authorized. Just as promptly some of the large property holders united in protest and also in resistance that became not only persistent but active. In Shepherd such a movement encountered for the first time equal persistence and activity as well as a superiority of resourcefulness in the art of defence and offence. As was observed a year later, "the grand plan was adopted with reckless haste and has been pushed with the utmost extravagance."[1] Except in its scope, the board treated the plan as merely suggestive. Instead of macadamizing nine-tenths of the street surface, as specified in the plan, the more expensive material of asphalt and wood was mainly used. More important still, instead of acting in accordance with the surmise expressed by the board in its comments on the comprehensive plan, that it "may require years for completion," the entire plan was practically carried out in about eighteen months, the period available for out-of-door work during the life of the board.

---

[1] Two instances are typical. The important position of treasurer was given to J. T. Johnson, a colored man, a cloak-room attendant at the capitol, which, however, he held only a short time. William A. Cook, a local political leader who had been corporation counsel during the Bowen administration and had been replaced by Enoch Totten when Emery was elected, was given a corresponding position under the new government.

[2] *The Nation*, 15, 328, Nov. 21, 1872.

[3] Investigation, 1872, p. 735.

[4] The same, p. 45.

---

[1] The commission consisted of William R. Smith, the superintendent of the Botanic Garden; John Saul, a successful Washington horticulturist; and William Saunders, in charge of the gardens of the Agricultural Department.

[2] Investigation, 1872, p. 45. Also in report of board of public works for 1872, maps of the city showing the area of street and sewer work.

[3] Stats., 16, 586, March 3, 1871. Laws, Legislative Assembly, Part 11, p. 24, Aug. 9, 1871.

[4] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, Argument, p. 109.

[5] *Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 27, 1871.

In doing so much in such a short time, in carrying out a hastily prepared plan, the board spent sixteen and one half millions instead of six. In addition a large part of two million dollars was used by the commission government, immediately following the close of the territorial government, in replacing defective work and completing unfinished contracts. To anxious property holders the sanction of the plan by the legislature and the loan measures did not appear to carry much weight. No doubt the board of trade expressed the opinion of many substantial citizens when it observed, in regard to the passing of a loan bill, that such action "was taken without investigation as was the case in other instances."[2] Some of the large property holders were not satisfied with resolutions. As soon as the legislature enacted the first loan measure, they organized resistance. But against their brains and influence were pitted the brains and energy of Alexander R. Shepherd, and while he had an advantage, as he was in official position and power, yet after all without a resourcefulness that was both rapid and daring, he soon would have been reduced to helplessness. In less than two weeks after the loan bill became a law the opposition formed a citizens' organization. Then a newspaper was started to help in the campaign of publicity.[1] At first an effort was made to compromise. Abandon the loan bill, it was proposed, and instead of going into debt adopt the pay-as-you-go plan. Do one-fourth of the work now, it was urged, and by levying a special tax raise a million and a half of dollars.[2] But so slight was the appeal of this proposition that those who favored it were obliged to abandon it and adopt the only alternative for united action and apply to the courts for an injunction.[3] In the meantime efforts had failed to create such a prejudice in financial circles against the loan that it could not be negotiated. For Governor Cooke, through his influential connections in New York City, had already sold the entire issue to the First National Bank of that city at 94 net, although the securities of the corporation were then selling at 80.[4] The bond issue was even pursued by its enemies to Europe, but in spite of all efforts the purchasers were not prevented from placing it. Although the injunction tied up the proceeds of the loan, the board of public works did not sit with folded hands awaiting the decision of the court, which was not made until some three months later.[5] Instead, the legislature appropriated, for beginning the improvements, half a million of dollars in anticipation of the current revenues, which were then about a million and a half dollars.[6] The injunctionists claimed that the proposed loan was illegal because the consent of the voters had not been first obtained. To provide for the contingency of an adverse court decision, the legislature passed another four million dollar loan bill, containing the proviso that it be submitted to a vote of the people. As this could not be done except at a regular election, the legislature directed that such an election be held, although only four months had passed since the last one.

---

[1] *Nation*, 15, 328, Nov. 21, 1872.

[2] *The Star*, Feb. 10, 1872.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Nov. 8, 1871.

[2] The same, July 25, 1871.

[3] The same, July 26; *The Star*, Aug. 1, 1871.

[4] Investigation, 1872, pp. 192 and 377.

[5] *Baltimore Sun*, Nov. 13, 1871.

[6] *The Star*, Aug. 5; *Baltimore Sun*, July 14, 1871.

Elections were costly, but such a consideration was not at this time or at any subsequent period allowed to stand in the way of doing what the board of public works undertook to do. At the same time there was no overconfidence as to the outcome of such an appeal to the people. No precaution was omitted that political skill could suggest. For while the local government was deprived of the patronage of the loan bill, it had that of the half million bill. The streets swarmed with men, tearing up the old sidewalks and grading, all of whom owed their jobs to the board of public works and were expected to vote for the loan bill.[1] For the decision reached by the board to adopt a scale of prices and make contracts on that basis [2] was laid aside and its execution deferred until after the loan bill vote. In the meanwhile the day's work system was used, which was given up during the Emery administration after it had been adopted in part at least by Bowen.[3] It may be said in passing that, when the board returned to its original plan, while the evil of underbidding of the lowest bidder system was avoided, contract jobbing and favoritism resulted.[4] In order to obtain the widest publicity for the loan election law, as it claimed, but as its opponents asserted to subsidize the press, the board went beyond the legislative act, which provided for its publication in not less than three newspapers for three months, and put it in all the newspapers of the District, some sixteen in number.[5] The enthusiasm for the loan was so intense with the officials, who had charge of supplying the polling places with the printed ballots, that while anti-loan ballots were printed they were very scarce on election day. Those determined to vote against the loan were obliged to write their own ballots.[1] A few days after the court sustained the board of public works, it won also at the polls. For the loan bill was carried by a vote of twelve to one, and the Democrats in the house of delegates were reduced from 7 to 2. However, as it proved, the election was not a contest. Practically only the friends of the city administration took the trouble to go to the polls. The total vote as compared with the one cast the previous April fell off 67 per cent.[2] So again in the new government, as in the old, the stay-at-home vote was large and was chiefly from that class described as having most at stake in the community.[3] For it was felt at this time, as was not unusual in cities, when such questions were pending, that "those who are to pay the bill have no chance" in an electorate where the non-taxpayer was so largely in the majority.[4] Thereafter the opposition to the board of public works was not at the polls. They became merely the scenes of factional contests.[5] The actual struggle, which continued unabated throughout the entire career of the government, was expressed in appeals to congress, that were successful to the extent that annually at each session of congress an investigation was made. It was also manifested by personal obstruction through the courts [6] and in refusing to pay the special assessments. To such an extent was the latter carried that near the close of the govern-

---

[1] Investigation, 1872, p. 89.

[2] The same, 1874, Vol. 1. Charges of memorialists, p. 1.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Nov. 10, 1871.

[4] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, p. ix. *The Nation*, 18, 406, June 25, 1874.

[5] Investigation, 1872, p. 190. The list is as follows: The *Chronicle*, the *Republican*, the *Star*, the *Anzeiger*, the *Patriot*, the *Critic*, then a

---

small theatre advertising paper, *Sunday Chronicle*, *Sunday Herald*, *Sunday Capitol*, *Sunday Gazette*, *Grand Army Journal*, *Georgetown Courier*, *Sunday Times*, the *Columbian*, a German paper, the *New National Era* and the *Public Voice*.

[1] Investigation, 1872, pp. 614 and 689.

[2] The same, 1872, p. 442. *Baltimore Sun*, April 21; *The Star*, Nov. 23, 1871.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Nov. 18, 1871.

[4] The same, Aug. 7, 1871. Investigation, 1872, p. 9.

[5] *Baltimore Sun*, Sept. 23 and 30, 1872; *The Star*, Oct. 15, 1873.

[6] *Baltimore Sun*, Nov. 7, 1872. Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1. Journal of Committee, pp. 6 and 11.

ment only 47 per cent of the street assessments had been paid.[1] At that time Shepherd declared that this was the cause, in part at least, of the embarrassed financial condition of the District government. On the other hand, the spirit of the authorities was equally determined and combative. As Shepherd very frankly explained, the street improvement work was started throughout the entire area at one time, and streets in all directions were torn up and citizens obliged to submit to the great inconvenience and annoyance of going through the winter with the city in that condition "because certain people in this District have fought us ever since the new government was organized."[2] Although the loan money did not become available until after the middle of November, near the close of the season for out-of-door work in the latitude of Washington, yet the scope of the work was at once enlarged from a half million to a six million basis. But even before the larger sum of money became available the work was on a scale that astounded those who doubted its wisdom. There were many who thought that such a display of energy and determination on the part of the people to make a capital worthy of the nation might have the effect of bringing congress to join in the work.[3] In fact, this consideration had weight with some citizens whose livelihood was not dependent on public work and brought them to support the policy of the new government. Even at that stage it was believed that congress would eventually assume the payment of the four million loan.[4] Such an expectation was voiced by General Chipman a few weeks before he took his seat for the first time as the District's representative in congress. He then asserted, in the course of an address at a local political gathering, that he believed, as the result of the policy of liberal improvements being carried out by the new government, that congress will be compelled to yield to a public sentiment that will demand "that the general government shall take upon itself a just share of expenditures in making the capital a type and exponent of American ideas and American institutions."[1] A few weeks later, in December, 1871, when members of congress came to attend the session of that body, they "gazed with wonder at the change in the general topography of the city," at "the miles of incomplete sewers, half-graded streets and half-paved sidewalks." They experienced the dangers as well as the discomforts of such conditions.[2] Then they listened to the reading of the message of President Grant, in which he commended what had been accomplished by the District government and said that Washington "is rapidly becoming a city worthy of the Nation's capital." Liberal District appropriations were urged "in order that the government may bear its just share of the expense of carrying out a judicious system of improvements."[3] The local government had other qualities than energy. They were expressed in the typically frank declaration of Shepherd, that the enemies of the town "would have to get up and git,"[4] in "the unchecked license" of governmental methods as well as an "absolute want of system and economy,"[5] and also by the showily uniformed governor's staff appointed by that official as commander-in-chief of the District militia just organized under a law which the legislature passed at its first session. While men were amused by the weakness of the vanity and while the new militia law had its defects, yet it was better than leaving the District without any organization, as had been the case for many years, owing to the neglect of congress.[6] The gilt-laced governor's staff was an object of satire, just as was the case with the organization of the Washington Club.[1] As some of the principal officers of the local government as well as contractors under the board of public works were members, it was termed the Ring Club House. In fact it was a citizens' social club, drawing to it men of both political parties. At its head was James G. Berret, a leading Democrat.[2] A club-house was erected on the site of 1409 New York Avenue. The liberal provision of card-rooms was apparently in accordance with the custom of the day. At the same period the Metropolitan Club of to-day was organized, although from 1863 to 1867 a club of the same name was in existence,[3] which was the first organization of the sort in the city, unless the club-house on Madison Place, now the Belasco Theatre site, mentioned in connection with the Sickles-Key murder in 1859, meant a social organization and not a mere place of resort.

---

[1] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, p. 467.

[2] The same, 1872, p. 404.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 27, 1871.

[4] Our Little Monarchy, Adams, p. 23.

---

[1] The D.C. under a New Form of Government, p. 14, Washington, 1871.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Nov. 11 and Dec. 5, 1871.

[3] Messages, 7, 154, Dec. 4, 1871.

[4] Investigation 1872, p. 404.

[5] *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 2, 1871.

[6] Journal House of Delegates, Vol. 4, p. 53, June 8, 1872. Report of Amos Webster, chief of staff with the rank of colonel commanding, stating the effective strength of the militia organized less than one year under the act of the legislature of Aug. 19, 1871, was about 800 men. The District militia was reorganized into the national guard in 1887.

The first Metropolitan Club occupied a building at the southwest corner of 15th and H streets, the site of the Union Trust building, which in 1869 became the property of James Wormley, a colored man,[4] who opened there a hotel. The second club of that name, when organized in 1872, made its home in a house at the southeast corner of 15th and H streets, formerly the residence of Commodore Morris, now the site of the Woodward building.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 13, 1872.

[2] Other officers were Henry D. Cooke, vice-president; Nathaniel B. Fugitt, secretary; and Hallet Kilbourn, treasurer. Trustees, J. G. Berret, A. R. Shepherd, S. S. Smoot, N. L. Jeffries, Hallet Kilbourn, R. T. Merrick, J. O. Evans, E. C. Ingersoll and N. B. Fugitt. *The Star*, Feb. 17, 1872.

[3] A brief history of the Metropolitan Club, John A. Baker.

[4] *Baltimore Sun*, April 2, 1869.

CHAPTER XX

VAGUE ESTIMATES OF COST

THE board of public works was unable to resume operations in the spring of 1872 until about the middle of April, owing to the investigation into its affairs ordered by the house in response to memorials from citizens. While again at the next session the persistency of the opposition brought about a second inquiry,[1] that, however, consumed but little time, so that after the spring of 1872 its operations were not interrupted by such a cause. The board therefore had the balance of that season and the whole of the next, which proved to be the last, as the third congressional investigation began early in 1874 and ended in June of that year with the abolition of the territorial government.

While the 1872 investigating committee of nine members with the exception of two found that the charges against the board "of corruption, misconduct or serious misgovernment not proved," and while it recognized mistakes had been made, yet on the whole "the zeal, energy and wisdom" displayed were to be commended. The committee took notice of the change in the plan by the general substitution of the more expensive wood and concrete pavements for macadam and gravel, but merely because such pavements "were somewhat experimental and will be for years." As to getting money to meet this extra outlay the committee gave no heed, apparently relying on the legislation enacted by congress, before the investigation had been concluded, fixing the debt limit at ten million dollars, as sufficient to dissipate the apprehension, expressed by the memorialists, of an indefinite increase in the debt.

---

[1] 42d Cong., 3d Sess., House Doc. No. 7, Dec. 20, 1872.

Yet at that time such a debt limit left a margin for new borrowings of only about one million dollars. For a section of the same law made, for the first time, the debts of the old corporations, amounting to about three and a half millions, a part of the District debt, while the District government had already authorized the issue of about five and one-half millions.[1] The acceptance of the unrevised estimates of the board was in keeping with the casual fashion of much of District legislation. It was also typical of Shepherd's way of doing things, which had all the dash and assurance of a bold operator in a speculative enterprise, that he should enlarge the scale of his operations, trusting to the chances of the future to provide the additional funds. He had done this from the outset, as the estimates of the original plan, set forth with such detail, were mere approximations.[2] How reliable his figures were may be judged from the report made at the next session by the house District committee, which had been directed by the house to ascertain what the debt was and "what will be required to finish the work." In submitting statements from the board of public works in answer to these inquiries the committee was of the opinion that from "the communications herewith submitted no further sums will be required to complete the work undertaken."[3] Even the minority of the committee of the first 1872 investigation, keen as it was to find grounds for objection, did not call attention to the paradox of a changed plan and an unchanged estimate, except perhaps inferentially, when it declared the powers assumed and exercised by the board as well as the reckless extravagance of the government generally were dangerous to the best interests of the people.

The only thing resembling even a suggestion of the inadequacy of the board's estimates heard in congress was rhetorical rather than mathematical, when Robert B. Roosevelt of New York, who signed the minority report, declared, in the course of a speech in the house, that the cost to the District was more likely to be twenty than four millions.[1] As it proved, the actual cost, outside of what the property holders paid, was about eighteen millions; [2] a great excess over the six and a quarter million estimate of the board, even after making generous allowance for losses due to careless, extravagant management, the dishonest work of contractors and the unfitness of much of the paving material.

---

[1] The total funded debt authorized was $9,795,323. Of this $8,883,940 was actually issued. Commissioner's Report, 1874, p. 269.

[2] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, p. viii.

[3] 42d Cong., 3d Sess., House Doc. No. 7, Dec. 20, 1872.

The only remedy proposed by the minority to cure defects in the government was an increase in the powers of the people by making all the officers elective and so directly responsible to the people for their acts. Later on when the board of public works had reached the ordained end of those who live beyond their means, there were some who thought that it would never have happened if the board had been an elective rather than an appointive body. Instead, however, of setting up a more representative form, congress abolished popular government entirely. So in 1872, instead of adding to the powers of the people in the city government, congress, a few days before the report of the investigating committee was made, lessened such powers. A debt limit was imposed,[3] when before the only restriction was the approval of the people at the polls. As far as the judgment of congress was expressed the plan was adequately financed. In fact that was the opinion of the house District committee that conducted the investigation and which was not changed after a further inquiry at the next session. The course of the local government led to the same conclusion. For in the first six months of its existence, in addition to the four million loan, nearly a million and a half of bonds were authorized by the legislature for purposes not included in the plan.[4]

---

[1] *Record*, p. 23, Dec. 4, 1872.

[2] The total debt was $22,184,363, including about 3½ millions of the old corporation debt.

[3] Stats., 17, 88, May 8, 1872.

[4] These bond issues as authorized were: water bonds, $450,000; market-house bonds, $300,000 ($152,000 issued); Piedmont Railroad subscription, $600,000 (not issued); and Chicago fire relief bonds $100,000.

No doubt the readiness both of the people and the legislature to borrow money had an influence with congress in its attempting to put on the brakes by means of a funded debt limit. However, the confidence shown by congress in the effectiveness of such a measure, while leaving wide open the way to incurring a floating debt, seems all the more remarkable as it was largely the growing proportions of the unsecured debts that brought about the downfall of the corporation government. It was not until several years later, when the commission form had been in existence for two years, that congress made it a high misdemeanor to increase the total indebtedness.[1]

As the event proved, the debt restriction had but slight if any effect. Yet both from the standpoint of the debt-increasing tendency of the local government and of the supposed adequate provision for financing the improvements, the fixing of a debt limit was wise. In addition, the one provided was generous, as at the time of the passage of the law ten millions was about eleven per cent of the assessed value of the real and personal property of the District.[2] It would have been more in keeping with sound business principles as well as with current conditions, especially at a time when, because of the improvements, property values were advancing, if the limit had been on a ratio basis rather than a fixed sum.[3] As it was, the creation of an immense floating debt was inevitable if the approved plan was to be carried out, and of that there could be no doubt in the mind of any one who saw the streets torn up throughout the entire area. Without the aid of the legislature the method of financing would have had a somewhat narrower scope, as it was a revival of the practice, under the corporation government, of creating a floating debt by the issue of certificates of various sorts, really a kind of currency, as the contractors took them in pay for the public work. In fact, the contract prices were largely determined by the market value of the securities, as was the case under the corporate government. The District paper which determined the contract price of public work fluctuated in value. When congress at the close of the territorial government provided for the funding of the floating debt, it was thought that a fair average of the depreciation of the certificates of this indebtedness for the entire period was about 25 cents on the dollar. On that basis the interest on the funding bonds was fixed at 3.65, yielding five per cent on 73.[1] Financial help came to the board from congress to an extent unprecedented in the District affairs. For at the session following the investigation of 1872 three and one quarter million dollars were appropriated to pay for the cost of improvements in front of public property.[2] Yet the area of improvement for which this great sum was provided was only a small percentage of that included within the board's plan, the total cost of which, counting the property holders' share, according to the board's estimate, would be six and a quarter millions. This striking incongruity was not noticed by congress. In paying for its share of improvements in front of public property at this time congress did what it had always done. Apparently, however, largely because it did not balk at the amount called for, so unprecedented in District affairs, it was thought by a newspaper friendly to the policy of the board that the national legislature would soon come to share as a property holder in the general local expenses as well as in street improvements.[3] With that prospect and having the coöperation of the federal government, for President Grant in his annual message had recommended the course adopted by congress in making appropriations,[1] Shepherd had reason to feel that fortune was with him. Besides, he had just come out for the second time from the perils of a congressional inquiry, while only a few months before he had won a signal and, in its form, a dramatic triumph over obstacles that, in one instance at least, had proved too much for the corporation government.

---

[1] Stats., 19, 212, March 14, 1876. [2] Investigation, 1872, p. 455.

[3] The Illinois state constitution, adopted in 1870, limited the debt of cities to 5 per cent of the assessed valuation. Address by Robert P. Porter before the American Social Science Association. *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Jan. 10, 1878.

---

[1] 44 Cong., 1st Sess., House Rep. Doc. No. 702, June 2, 1876. When first listed on the New York stock exchange the bonds were quoted from 70⅜ to 70¼. (*Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, May 1, 1875, Vol. 20, p. 423.) A week later the price ranged from 75¼ to 74¼. (The same, pp. 446–449.) Before the passage of the permanent commission bill the bonds were quoted at 85. 45th Cong., 3d Sess., House Doc. No. 44, Dec. 19, 1878.

[2] Stats., 17, 406 and 526, Jan. 8 and March 3, 1873.

[3] *The Star*, March 3, 1873.

One evening about eight o'clock, as some of the owners of stands in the jumble of sheds and shacks that bore the name of the Northern Liberties Market at 7th and K streets, now Mount Vernon Square, were arranging their stock in preparation for the Thursday market on the following morning, a gang of workmen in the employ of the board appeared and with orderly rapidity tore down the structures and cleared the square.[2] Two weeks before the marketmen had received notice from the board of public works to move, as the buildings occupying a public square were in the way of proposed improvements. But they refused to leave, although places were provided for them in temporary structures erected on a market site at the northwest corner of 7th and O streets, which the local government had recently acquired.[3] Anticipating further action on the part of the District, the marketmen had about decided to apply to the courts for an injunction. They were too leisurely. Before they had gone that far the market buildings had disappeared. So without the law's delay the work of city improvement went on.

As the result of the dissatisfaction over this summary ousting, as well as a difference of opinion which had developed in the legislature in regard to a site for a new market, one party

[1] Messages, Richardson, 7, 204, Dec. 3, 1872.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, Sept. 4, 1872.

[3] This was a part of an elaborate plan to provide market-houses in various parts of the city, to carry out which the legislature had authorized a bond issue of $300,000, of which, however, but $152,000 was issued. Land was bought at the southeast corner of 21st and K streets, where a market-house was begun in 1872 to take the place of the one that had occupied for so many years the roadway of K Street between 19th and 20th streets. The old K Street building was removed and erected on leased ground on H between 2d and 3d streets, N. E. Commissioner's Report, 1875, p. 56.

preferring a location a few squares farther west, some of the dealers formed an association to erect a market-house.[1] Later on a building was erected on the square beteen K and L and 4th and 5th streets.

A few weeks later Shepherd planned to improve 1st Street and Maryland Avenue as far west as 6th Street, then occupied by the tracks of the Alexandria and Washington Railroad, which at that time was no longer the sole southern railroad connection. As the grade of the street was to be raised, Shepherd followed the custom in such matters and notified the company to conform its roadbed to the proposed level. The company, equally conventional, followed much of the current railroad practice in dealing with the local authorities and paid no attention to the notice. In addition, the company prevented the efforts made by the city to do the work.[2] Ten days after the notice was served a force of 200 men, sent by the board of public works, in the course of one night tore up the tracks along the entire course of the proposed improvements,[3] thus removing a nuisance which had long been the subject of complaint by citizens and members of congress, as the tracks were insufficiently guarded and besides passed directly across the principal approach to the capitol. The result of this summary action was so in accord with public sentiment, and in addition the company, never very strong, was feeling the effects of the competition of the new connection built by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., that no attempt was made to replace the tracks.

The board met with no resistance from the street-car companies or the gas company, the other corporations using the streets, to the plan adopted of having all pipes as well as car tracks laid before the pavement was put down. A large section of the right of way of the Metropolitan Railway Co., secured either from congress or by acquiring other companies,[4] was still unbuilt. The company, however, when a street was to be paved, put down sleepers and ties and laid wooden strips where the rails were to be, so that the entire surface could be finished. However, the board and the companies parted on the further requirement that the paving done by the companies between the tracks, as their charters required, should be the same kind as that which was being laid at public expense. Both the Washington and Georgetown Co. and the Metropolitan Co. held they could not stand the expense, the latter company asserting that it would be confiscatory to be obliged to pay the board paving rates for a width of eighteen feet through fourteen miles of double tracks.[1] So the case was taken to the courts. In the meantime the board did the work, charging the cost to the company, and, following its usual practice, issued certificates for the cost against the roads. These certificates were sold by the board to third parties.[2] While these dummy tracks, so to speak, were laid in 1872, yet in the course of two years they were replaced by the actual rails along the various lines or extensions of the Metropolitan Co. and the cars were in operation. To sell the stock it was necessary to make earnest appeals to the self-interest and public spirit of the residents along the line of the proposed extensions. It is quite evident there was no general market, although, after the first three years, beginning in 1868, an annual dividend had been paid.[3] However, the lines in the older sections did better. The Washington and Georgetown Co. began to pay a dividend six months after the cars were running, while the Columbia

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 25, 1872.

[2] History of Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Vol. 1, p. 353.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Nov. 19 and 20, 1872.

[4] The companies merged with the Metropolitan at this period were the Connecticut Avenue and Park Railway Co. chartered by congress;

---

the Union Railway Co., chartered by the legislature, the combined right of way being from 17th and H streets via Connecticut Avenue through Georgetown; and the Boundary and Silver Spring Railroad, chartered by the legislature to occupy Georgia Avenue. Investigation, 1874, Vol. 2, p. 870.

[1] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 2, p. 870.

[2] Thirteen years later, when the District brought suit to recover its bill for paving, the court held that the District had no authority to issue such certificates, but that action did not discharge the liability of the companies to the District. MacArthur, Vol. 4, p. 214, June 15, 1885.

[3] 45th Cong., 3d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 18, Dec. 16, 1878.

Railway Co., a year after its completion in 1871, did the same.[1]

The difficulty in placing the Metropolitan stock may have been due alone to the straitened circumstances of the citizens in 1872 and 1873. A large number of the property holders felt the pinch when they were called upon to pay special assessments. In addition there was a further drain, as it was necessary to make accessible property that had been left perched on the edge of a ravine perhaps twenty feet deep or sunk to the second story below the new street level. Many people lost their property because they could not meet these charges.[2] Then current taxes were higher; for while the rate [3] was $1.70, ten cents less than the Washington city rate during the last year of the mayoralty government, the assessed value steadily increased.[4] While the law permitted a tax rate of not more than $2, yet no change was made until the last year, when the maximum was reached. Moreover, in 1873, with doubtful legality, the legislature directed that the entire cost of sewer construction be paid by means of a sewer tax.[5] At the same time consideration was manifested for the property holder, as provision was made to settle claims for damages when it could be shown that the value of property had been lessened. Like a good many other local measures it was only partially effective because of the lack of money.

---

[1] Report of the Columbia Railway Co. from September, 1871, to September, 1885 (n. d. n. p.).

[2] *The Nation*, 18, 406, June 25, 1874.

[3] In Georgetown and the county there was both a lower rate as well as a lower assessment.

[4] The assessed values of District real property according to the last assessment of the old governments and those made by the territorial government are as follows, deduction being made in the figures of 1871 and 1872 for the personal tax as that class of property was not taxed after 1872:—

1871	$68,650,000
1872	74,969,000
1873	87,869,000
1874	96,433,000

Investigation, 1872, p. 455. Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, governor's answer, p. 26.

[5] The same, 1874, p. 470.

The experience of Senator George F. Edmunds and Senator Thomas F. Bayard was probably not uncommon. They had built houses at 1411 and 1413 Massachusetts Avenue, which, according to Senator Bayard, were left by the grading of the avenue on the edge of a great gulf.[1] The senators estimated their properties had been damaged to the extent of $2500 and $3000, respectively. But they settled by accepting a receipted bill for a little over $400 in each case, which was the amount of the special assessments. However, at the close of the territorial government provision was made by congress for damage claims, in allowing them to be paid in the 3.65's.[2] While the burden of taxation and increased property costs bore some owners to the ground and chafed the shoulders of others, yet relief came in some cases as the burdens were lightened by the wider, higher market for real estate that began to develop as soon as the plan of improvements was made known. As illustrating the diverse state of mind, when some property holders learned what the board proposed to do, they wanted to sell out their holdings, while others wanted to buy, in order to take advantage of the rise in values which they believed the carrying out of such a plan would bring about.[3] But the buyers outnumbered the sellers, so prices advanced. Building became active.[4] Even the general government shared in the improvement movement. In 1872 it completed what it started to do just prior to the breaking out of the war: acquired two squares and enlarged the eastern capitol grounds by continuing the boundary lines of North B and South B streets to First Street, E. Congress found other places for its post-office, its stables and machine shops that were in old structures on the purchased squares. These were removed as well as the tracks of the Washington and Georgetown Railroad that for a decade had extended through the grounds close to the flight of steps that led to the great porticos of the wings.[1] Then began, under the direction of Fred Law Olmsted, landscape architect, the Capitol Park as it is to-day, as well as its exclusive use as a setting for the great pile of granite. Congress also looked beyond the Capitol Park and began to provide in the annual appropriation bills for the improvement of the public grounds, especially the Mall. What was being done by the city was supplemented in character at least, if not in extent, by the general government. Such appropriations were expended under the direction of Colonel Orville E. Babcock, engineer corps U.S.A., who had been an aide to the president until 1871, when he was appointed commissioner of public buildings,[2] and who also was in sympathy with and in personal accord with Shepherd and his associates.[3] Shepherd was active in the campaign of 1872 that resulted in the choice of General Grant for a second term. He was one of the delegates to the national Republican convention and was made chairman of the inaugural committee that was chosen at a publicly called meeting of citizens. An inaugural ball building was erected on Judiciary Square, but owing to the prevailing low temperatures, the affair proved too chilly and the ladies were obliged to wear their wraps.

---

[1] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 3, p. 1985.

[2] Commissioner's Report, 1874, p. 267.

[3] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 2, p. 261.

[4] Permits issued 1872, 1039; 1873, 1073; 1874, 853; 1875, 1744. In the last-named year the estimate of cost was $3,655,500.

The speculative movement in property, while it did not reach large proportions, except relatively, was distinguished as the only one Washington had since the days of Greenleaf and Law, more than eighty years before. At this time the largest buying interest was the California syndicate that, beginning early in 1871, when the plan of the board of public works became known, invested about $600,000 in unimproved property in the vicinity of Dupont Circle,[1] then a stretch of commons with hardly a building. Senator William M. Stewart of Nevada began buying in connection with Curtis J. Hillyer, with whom he had been interested in mining operations in the west. In a short time Stewart sold out and another California miner, Thomas Sunderland, took his place. Then Stewart bought from his former associates the entire square at the northwest corner of Connecticut Avenue and Dupont Circle, which was sold for fifty cents a foot, with the understanding that he would build a residence there.[2] In the spring of 1873 he erected the house which came to be known as Stewart's Castle. At that time the railway line along Connecticut Avenue had been completed but a few months.[3] Almost equal in importance, at least as a market factor, was the purchase at this time, by the British government, of a building site at the northwest corner of Connecticut Avenue and N Street, only a block south of Dupont Circle, where a residence for the British minister was at once erected.[4] The British government's purchase had what seemed a wider significance than merely its market effect, for with the exception of the Prussian government, which had purchased, a year after the close of the war, the residence, 734 15th Street, for the home of its representative in the United States, no foreign government owned a legation building in this country. But it did not prove to be a fruitful precedent after all, as years passed before another foreign government became a holder of Washington city property.

---

[1] *Baltimore Sun*, Aug. 3, 1868, and Feb. 27, 1872. 42d Cong., 3d Sess., House Doc. No. 47, Dec. 19, 1872.

[2] Investigation, 1872, p. 628.

[3] In his annual report for 1874, Colonel Babcock favored an appropriation to establish a Zoölogical Garden. He had already provided places in the public grounds for gifts of animals made to the government. For instance in 1872, an eagle was placed in Franklin Park; in 1873, two deer and later a pair of prairie dogs in Lafayette Park. See reports of commissioner of public buildings and grounds for these years. In 1872 he introduced into the city German and English sparrows.

It was at this period that Shepherd, in connection with Adolph Cluss and Hallet Kilbourn, improved the entire frontage on K Street between Connecticut Avenue and 17th Street by the erection of three stone residences. The larger one on the corner of Connecticut Avenue and K Street was occupied by Shepherd and was the scene of the elaborate social entertaining which he loved. While Hillyer followed the example of his former associate and erected a large residence, now the site of 2121 Massachusetts Avenue, yet that ended the building operations of the California syndicate. The development of the section of the city where its purchases lay was not as rapid as had been expected. For many years building lots there as well as in all sections were far in excess of the building demand.

---

[1] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 2, p. 220.

[2] The same, p. 209.

[3] *Baltimore Sun*, Nov. 4, 1872.

[4] Sir Edward Thornton, the British minister, was then occupying the residence at the northeast corner of Farragut Square and I Street, which was purchased in 1865 by Charles Knapp from Elisha Riggs, who built the house a short time after his brother, George W. Riggs, had completed in 1854 the residence adjoining on the east.

Still, after the close of the season of 1873 when the last of the operations under the board of public works and when the comprehensive plan was largely completed,[1] President Grant stated in his annual message to congress that "Washington is rapidly assuming the appearance of a capital of which the Nation may well be proud. It is now one of the most sightly cities in the country and can boast of being the best paved."[2] But when the president wrote his message, it was not known that the paved and sewered city had been secured at the cost of a debt which had a per capita size nearly as great as that of New York city, swollen by the operations of the Tweed régime and entirely beyond the means of the community to carry. However, what had been done in the District had been going on throughout the country in an attempt to supply railroads and develop the national resources to an extent that was beyond the means of the people. Some two months before the president's message was sent to congress the overstrain of credit had resulted in the failure of the great banking house of Jay Cooke and Co., and then the panic of 1873 began. The machinery of paper credit that enabled the board of public works, with the coöperation of the legislature, to continue its operations was no longer available.[3] While the Jay Cooke failure was national in its influence, it had a local effect apart from that on the District government's financing and the circumstances of the community, as the Washington branch of Jay Cooke and Co. and the First National Bank, a subsidiary concern, closed their doors. Henry D. Cooke, a member of the firm and president of the bank, was obliged by the pressure of his affairs to resign as governor of the District. In accepting the resignation President Grant took occasion to express his satisfaction with the change made in city conditions [1] in the same spirit that in the following December he wrote the District section of his message to congress. His choice of Shepherd for the vacancy was promptly confirmed by the senate. When, however, two days later, a motion to reconsider was made, it was lost by a vote of only 21 to 34.[2] This sentiment hostile to Shepherd, by the close of that session increased by the revelations of the investigating committee and the changed conditions in District affairs, made the vote rejecting his nomination as District commissioner nearly unanimous. However, in the closing month of 1873, some seven months before the territorial government was abolished, Shepherd became the titular as well as the real head of District affairs. The general financial condition throughout the country hastened the crisis in the District. It did not cause it. It put an end to the temporary expedient of fresh borrowings and besides reduced the current revenues, owing in part to the inability of the citizens to get the money to pay their taxes. But the District was bankrupt several months before the panic began, as then it was unable to pay the salaries of school-teachers, policemen, firemen and other employés.[3] As the Bowen administration had used for current purposes the funds derived from the taxes paid for special objects, so the territorial government in its desperate straits had spent even the $75,000 which congress had paid for the District share in the city hall, although the law expressly stipulated that it should be used in the erection of a District building.

---

[1] Commissioner's Report, 1874, p. 165.

[2] Messages, Richardson, 7, 254, Dec. 1, 1873.

[3] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, p. xii.

There was no reference to the financial condition of the government in the charges brought by citizens against the District authorities early in 1874 and which resulted in an investigation by a joint committee of congress that lasted four months. Recklessness and extravagance on the part of the local administration were again formally charged as in the 1872 investigation. While then the scope of the investigation included the current rumors affecting the honesty of District officials, at this time they were made a part of the formal accusations, an indication of the increase in the bitterness of the opposition.[1] For the board had done its work in a state of war, marked by a degree of uneasiness, distrust and alarm, especially on the part of many taxpayers, that made the relations in the community somewhat similar to those that existed after the firing on Fort Sumter. Then suspicion branded friend and neighbor with the charge of disloyalty, now it arraigned them as corrupt and dishonest in local government affairs. What had been done in Washington, as well as the way it had been done, was not merely of local interest but national, as indicated by the course of out-of-town newspapers, particularly those of New York city, in accounts of the operations of the board of public works which were commonly referred to as the work of the Washington ring, led by Shepherd, who was given the title of Boss. The latter, as was his nature, struck back. After he became a private citizen he began proceedings for libel against the editors of two of the leading New York newspapers.[2] In the local struggle which continued with hardly any let-up for three years the feeling towards the close became so intense that both parties were blinded by passion. On the one hand, the memorialists of 1874, in addition to accusations of contract jobbery, charged that the direction of improvements was determined by the location of property in which officers of the local government were interested as members of a real estate pool. On the other hand, an attempt was made to bring discredit upon Columbus Alexander, one of the memorialists, by making it appear that he incited the blowing open of a safe in the office of the assistant district attorney, Richard Harrington,[1] to secure papers that were supposed to be damaging to District officials. The three-quarters of a million dollars of the real estate pool, as figured in the charges, dwindled down to $60,000, and the connection of District officials, except perhaps remotely Governor Cooke, because of a subscription to the pool made by the firm of Jay Cooke and Co., of which he was a member, was not established.[2] On the other hand, the safe robbery turned out to be a melodramatic sort of affair, a clumsy attempt to involve an innocent man.[3] What was undoubtedly real about both of these occurrences was their revelation of the state of mind.[4] After all such expressions of feeling had to do with how the bankrupt condition of the District had been brought about. They had reference to the past. Congress realized it had to deal with the present and the future. How was the District to go on? At the outset of the investigation Governor Shepherd answered that question when he told the committee of "the difficulty if not the impossibility of making the receipts meet the necessary expenditures" unless congress did its part as a property holder.[5] As to exactly what that part was he had stated officially only the previous year.[6] It was one-half because, as he calculated, the government owned one-half of the value of the real property in the District. To reach such a result, however, he placed a value of thirty cents a square foot on the streets and avenues. In this way he added fifty per cent to the valuation of government property, consisting of the parks and reservations and public buildings. A year before it did not occur to him to include the streets, so that then his estimate of the value of the government holdings did not go beyond two-thirds of that of other District property.[1]

---

[1] *The Star*, Sept. 13, 1873.

[2] Executive Journal, Senate, Dec. 10 and 16, 1873.

[3] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, pp. 462 and 469.

---

[1] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1. Charges of the memorialists, p. 6.

[2] Proceedings were brought against Charles A. Dana of the *Sun* (*Baltimore Sun*, July 11, 1874), and Whitelaw Reid of the *Tribune*. (*New York Tribune*, Jan. 19, 1875.)

---

[1] At that time Harrington was also secretary of the territory and was one of Shepherd's counsel before the investigating committee.

[2] 44th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 242, March 14, 1876.

[3] 43d Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 477, June 23, 1874.

[4] In both instances there was an aftermath of court proceedings, resulting, however, in no conviction. Criminal charges were brought against Harrington and two others for conspiracy in hatching up the safe robbery plot, while Hallet Kilbourn, the manager of the real estate pool, successfully appealed to the courts for release from prison when he had been committed by the house because of refusal to give the names of members of the pool. *Baltimore Sun*, April 29, 1876; *The Star*, Nov. 24 and 27, 1874, and April 11, 1876.

[5] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, governor's answer, p. 469.

[6] Report of Board of Public Works, p. 3, 1873.

Two months after the committee began to take testimony, the trend of events was indicated by the declaration in the senate of Justin M. Morrill of Vermont that "there is a general impression that the territorial government would be a short-lived one."[2] It also became more generally apparent, as the extent of the indebtedness was revealed, that even if the government was changed and District taxation increased, congress would have to share the burden or else the repudiation of millions of debt would follow. It was not a palatable conclusion from the standpoint of the policy of the past. How little such a consideration had weight is evident from the course of the house, even before an investigation was ordered, in directing one of its committees to make an inquiry as to "the legal relations between the federal government and the local government of the District of Columbia and the extent and character of the mutual obligations in regard to municipal expenses" and "whether some accurately defined basis of expenditure cannot be prescribed and maintained by law." This inquiry, so unprecedented in its scope, was made by the judiciary committee. The report presented by Luke P. Poland of Maine placed the relations of the District and the federal government on broad national grounds, holding that it was not an ordinary municipality but a federal centre. It was maintained therefore that congress should contribute towards the cost of running it, not alone because of government property interests, but for the reason that it was the Nation's capital city. In the opinion of the committee the federal proportion should be fifty per cent of the annual current expenses.[1] The Poland report advanced no new doctrine. That Washington as the national capital was designed primarily for federal use had been declared in the Southard report forty years before. Once this proposition admitted, both committees accepted, as a corollary, federal sharing in municipal expenses. But never before had such an inquiry been made at the instance of either house and never before had such a conception of federal interests or at least of federal responsibility in the national centre accorded with so much of the current opinion of congress. The latter was so decided that there were said to have been instances of citizens who were so convinced that congress would not only assume the debt, but pay the entire cost of running the District, that they refused to pay taxes for the current year.[2] A few weeks after the Poland report was made, the investigating committee, in submitting the evidence taken as to District conditions, reached a similar conclusion as to federal participation in municipal expenses. As to the exact ratio, that was to be left to the committee which was appointed, as the report recommended, to prepare a form of government. Although not clearly or generally recognized at the time, a condition of such a fiscal relation was direct federal control. Both were provided by the law of June 20, 1874, establishing a government of the District. For by that act the government was administered by a commission of three members appointed by the president and confirmed by the senate. Congress undertook to pay no fixed part of the municipal expenses, but to supplement, as it saw fit, the revenue derived from the taxation of citizens. As the local treasury was empty and there were many current demands unpaid, it was found that the revenues must be increased. The tax rate was therefore changed from $2 to $3. Congress made an appropriation which was about forty-four per cent of the entire expenditure.[3] At the next session, when the plea of the inability of the people to pay a higher rate was made, the $1.50 rate was adopted, although it was pointed out in congress that with such a tax the District share in municipal expenses would be less than one-half.[1] Thereafter no change was made in the rate in spite of the fact, which was often recurred to in congress, that it was less than many members of congress were accustomed to in their home communities. Besides, a tax rate was commonly regarded as the measure of the weight of taxation. Such a notion was based on the acceptance of taxation assessment as at the cash or market value, as the prevailing tax laws of the country directed, thus ignoring the current practice that made it from one-third to one-half less. But in the District, where in the later period at least of the corporation government the assessment value was about two-thirds, it had risen to the full value during the territorial form and no change in that particular was made during the temporary commission government.[2] Still the protests of citizens against excessive taxation at the outset of the temporary form,[3] while called forth in part because congress had adopted the last assessment of the territorial government, which was the highest ever made, was more directly aimed at the fifty per cent increase in the rate.[4] Congress met the problem of caring for the great debt by providing for its funding in bonds bearing 3.65 per cent interest, guaranteed by the United States and having a sinking-fund requirement. Annual appropriations by congress provided for those charges, while to meet the deficiencies in local revenues congress made further appropriations. With the exception of the bond interest, the appropriations were not specific and were paid

---

[1] The same, 1872, p. 21. The thirty-three millions of street value brought the total up to ninety-six millions, the assessed value of private property.

[2] *Record*, p. 3567, May 4, 1874.

---

[1] 43d Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 627, June 1, 1874.

[2] *Record*, p. 5122, June 17, 1874.

[3] Commissioner's Report, 1875, p. 4.

---

[1] *Record*, pp. 1294, 1296 and 1608, Feb. 15, 1875.

[2] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 2, p. 26. Also Commissioner's Report, 1875, p. 26.

[3] *The Star*, June 9; *The Chronicle*, June 21, 1874.

[4] The annual assessments under the temporary commission form (reports of commissioners) were as follows: —

1874	$97,875,000
1875	93,452,000
1876	95,985,000
1877	97,609,000

over to the commissioners in bulk. While there was a local treasurer, there was no local treasury, as from the beginning, at their own volition, the commissioners deposited all moneys in the United States treasury, from which they were withdrawn only upon their warrant upon the United States treasurer.[1] For four years, or until the permanent form was adopted, the commissioners continued to disburse, through their own accounting officers, the money drawn both from federal and local sources. After that federal control was extended, as all local disbursements were made by congressional appropriations based on estimates by the commissioners and the accounts settled by the accounting offices of the treasury department.

Although the law of 1874 was adopted as the committee had prepared it, without debate or delay, yet that was not because of unanimity of opinion as much as the lateness in the session when the investigation was concluded as well as the determination of congress to change at once the control of District affairs. Besides, the measure was looked upon as a mere stopgap until congress had more time. In point of fact, great diversity of opinion prevailed. For the next session, which brought to a close the congress that adopted this form of government, ended, a new congress came and went while the flood of views and interests ebbed and flowed in the discussion of District affairs, and plans for the government were submitted by two joint committees. It was not until the first session, nearly four years later, of the third congress that had the subject before it, that final action was reached.

There were more than mere differences of opinion. The strength of the animosities and resentments of the three years' struggle over city improvements and Shepherd's way of carrying them out is indicated by the care exercised by the investigating committee of 1874 in avoiding in its report subjects that might arouse discussion and passion.[2] The report, which was characterized as mild,[1] did not give voice to the current talk, which, however, was not sustained by the evidence, that Shepherd and his associates were personally corrupt. No doubt his enemies and the scandal-loving portion of the public would have been gratified if the report had plunged into the muck-heap. On the other hand, such a course would have aroused the resentment of Shepherd's friends, who were influential and included the president of the United States, and would have imperilled the chances of action at that session in making a change in District control that was held to be the first essential. Mere personal rancor and feeling were further held in check by a very general recognition of the value of what Shepherd had done. This was given voice in the report, when it stated that "while your committee join in the general expression of gratification at beholding the improved condition of the national capital, the embellishment and advancement everywhere visible, they cannot but condemn the methods by which this sudden and rapid transition was made."

---

[1] Commissioner's Report, 1874, p. 4. It was not until the close of the first year of the temporary government that such a disposition of the funds was directed by congress. Stats., 18, 505, March 3, 1875.

[2] *Record*, p. 1207, Feb. 2, 1875. The same, p. 216, Jan. 25, 1876.

Commendation of the improvement in city conditions was expressed in congress at the next session and subsequent sessions.[2] It may be concluded that the changed appearance of the city, revealing its possibilities as a dignified and worthy seat of the national government, was a factor of wide-reaching importance in the course pursued by congress at this critical period in District affairs.

The committee did not go even to the extent of recommending that legal proceedings be brought against District officials for the violation of the debt-limit law, as was the case two years later when the house asked for the opinion of the attorney-general as to the legality of the action of the District commissioners in certain street contract work.[3] However, the committee did not hesitate to criticise with boldness and condemn with severity the methods of the government. It brushed aside the technicalities advanced by the board in its defence and charged that a large part of the great debt had been created in violation of law.[1] If the old congressional attitude had been maintained, the further assertion of the committee that the debt had been contracted, with the expectation that aid would come from congress, would have proved highly irritating.[2] Nor were the federal-appointed officers of the territorial government alone held responsible. For it was pointed out by the committee, as well as written on the local statute books, that the legislature, one body of which was elected by the people, had aided the board of public works in piling up the debt by giving its sanction to the issue of various kinds of certificates of indebtedness, which were either hypothecated by the board or used in the payment of its obligations.[3]

---

[1] *The Nation*, 18, 406, June 25, 1874.

[2] *Record*, pp. 120 and 121, Dec. 17, 1874. The same, p. 818, Feb. 2, 1876. Also p. 2116, March 28, 1878.

[3] 44th Cong., 2d Sess., Ex. Doc. No. 26, Jan. 19, 1877.

It was felt that advantage had been taken of congress. To avoid a repetition in the future was a strong motive with congress in assuming direct legislation. The new form had the same defect in scattering responsibility as the old, but not in such important particulars. In the haste of legislation all administrative functions were not vested in the commissioners, and it was not until the permanent government was established that the police, health and school boards were abolished and these powers and duties invested in the commissioners.[4] No attempt was made in 1874 to do anything with the mass of the laws now increased by the acts of the legislature. But by the law establishing a permanent form provision was made for their codification. The work was done by Edward C. Ingersoll, a member of the District bar, but like the one prepared in accordance with the act of the legislature of 1872 it was not acted upon by congress.[1] While the offices of governor, secretary and the board of public works, and the legislature were abolished, Chipman, the District delegate, was allowed to serve out his term, which ended with the close of the next session. For it was suggested he might be of service, as at that time the government matter was to come up. Although he was personally acceptable in congress, the office itself, as a means of saving the time of members of congress by being a medium through which the views and wishes of citizens could be expressed, had proved, according to Senator George F. Edmunds, disappointing.[2]

---

[1] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1. Memorial in Regard to Drainage, p. 95.

[2] The same, p. xiv.

[3] The certificates authorized by the legislature were as follows: for water main assessments (Laws, 3d Leg. Assembly, June 23, 1873, p. 43); arrears of taxes (the same, June 25, 1873, p. 81); sewers (the same, June 26, 1873, p. 107). The last, the largest issue, amounting to over two millions of dollars, was made a part of the unsecured debt and funded in 3.65's.

[4] In 1873 (Stats., 17, 619, March 3) congress changed the colored school board from a federal to a local body by transferring the appointment of its members from the secretary of the interior to the governor of the District. In 1874 the commissioners (Report, 1874, p. 19) consolidated the four school boards, Washington, Georgetown, the county and that of the colored schools into one body of nineteen members and that was the system provided for in the District government law of 1878.

No restriction of a District residence qualification was placed by the law upon the president in his choice of commissioners, as was the case when the permanent government was adopted and a three-years residence required. But one of the three names sent to the senate was that of a District citizen. With that sturdy virtue of fidelity to friends that was the admiration of men, even when they did not approve the results, President Grant nominated Shepherd, who was promptly and decisively rejected.[3] William A. Dennison of Ohio, who had been governor of that state and a member of Lincoln's cabinet, and Henry T. Blow of Missouri, a former member of the house, whose names had been sent to the senate with that of Shepherd, were at once confirmed. As if anticipating such action in Shepherd's case, the president was ready with another name. The same day he nominated William G. Cattell of New Jersey, who had a year or so before ended a term in the senate, but who declined to serve. After congress adjourned the board was completed by the appointment of John H. Ketcham of New York, whose term in the house ended at the close of the previous congress.[1] As the law, in pursuance of the federalizing policy, directed that public improvement work should be in charge of an army engineer officer, Lieutenant Richard L. Hoxie was detailed for that service. A month before the president nominated Lieutenant Hoxie as member of the board of public works in place of Adolph Cluss, who had been removed. The senate, however, did not confirm the nomination until two days before the board was abolished.[2] The practice thus begun was made a more distinctive feature of the permanent form, as it was then provided that one of the three commissioners should be an army engineer. The commissioners occupied the quarters of the board of public works in the building, 214–216 John Marshall Place.

---

[1] The code of 1872 was prepared by George P. Fisher, judge of the District supreme court, and Hugh Caperton, Samuel L. Phillips, Edward C. Ingersoll and R. D. Mussey members of the bar. Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. 3, p. 125.

[2] *Record*, p. 3779, May 25, 1878.

[3] Executive Journal, Senate, June 23, 1874. The vote was 32 to 6.

The final elimination from the government of the man who had been its motive force as well as its storm centre was variously received. It was thought that he was the victim of the enemies he had made while in the public service, and especially that he had been sacrificed to satisfy newspaper clamor.[3] It was also reasoned, in the judicial fashion that marked the editorial utterances of the *Chronicle* since James Harlan of Iowa, after his term in the senate closed in 1873, had become its proprietor,[4] that the senate had concluded it was better to select men who had been entirely disconnected with the District government.[5] By some the abolition of the government was regarded as a condemnation of Shepherd and by others as a way of getting rid of a system that was recognized as cumbrous and expensive.[1] No doubt the attitude of many with a friendly feeling towards Shepherd was expressed by a senator who said to a friend of Shepherd, "We would like to have confirmed Shepherd, but we felt that to give him any more money would be like pouring it into a sieve."[2] To Shepherd the rejection by the senate came as a blow, for it meant not so much a political defeat or even the triumph of personal enemies as the separation from an undertaking not yet finished, to which in a very genuine and sincere fashion he had devoted years of his life. Besides this disappointment there was the condition of his personal affairs, which had become so much worse during the three years of his absorption in public affairs that in a little over two years after he left the public service he acknowledged bankruptcy.[3] But neither of these set-backs sapped either his energy or the buoyancy of his spirits. In a remote region of Mexico, where he spent the twenty-two years that remained to him of life, developing a mining property, he ruled with the same absoluteness and spent money in the same lavish way that marked his reign in Washington. But he attained results in both places. Only seven years after he left Washington, on the occasion of his first visit to his old home, he was welcomed by a great civic demonstration as the creator of the modern city. His death, which occurred in 1902, was the signal for a public movement which resulted in the erection of his statue by popular subscription in front of the District building.[4] As men in 1874 thought differently about Shepherd, so they did in regard to the new order he brought about in District affairs. They lacked the perspective of time. At the outset the commissioners were looked upon by many as mere receivers of a bankrupt concern,[1] as a mere temporary expedient.[2] Then when the temporary was changed into the permanent form, it only gradually came to be recognized that the new government represented a conception of the District that had up to this time lacked the support of any general sentiment of interest and pride in the capital city as a national centre. Although the commission form was advocated during the period just prior to 1871 of the agitation for a change, the motive, both with citizens and members of congress who favored it, was political. They wanted to get rid of the negro vote. Then the sharing by congress in city expenses was not a part of the plan. Now it was. It overshadowed every other consideration. Because when congress met the situation of a bankrupt district by adopting the policy of federal sharing in local expenses, the federal assumption of the local government was also involved. Otherwise it would have been necessary to solve the baffling problem of a satisfactory blending of federal and local authority in the disbursement of a revenue for municipal uses derived both from the general government and from local taxpayers.[3] There was hardly any objection heard in congress to federal participation, in spite of nearly three-quarters of a century of resistance and opposition from that quarter.[4] It was not a political question as to whether the United States paid a part or none at all of the District expenses. It was, however, national, in the sense that in order to vote public money for such a purpose, there must be a sentiment in the country that looked upon Washington as a federal city, as the national capital and not as an ordinary municipality. Such a sentiment had arisen and was extending,[5] and the realization of that had an influence in the national legislature. As the difference of opinion in congress was but slight as to the wisdom of the policy of participation, or at all events as to its necessity, the question then arose as to what the United States ought to contribute. As such a question was "not susceptible of exact determination," and besides was not "important," the first joint committee favored leaving it indefinite.[1] The second joint committee at the next congress in 1876 fixed the federal share of the District expenses at 40 per cent, for the reason that it was estimated to be a little less than the ratio of the value of government property to private property.[2] Then the house District committee of the following congress, in a plan of government, fixed upon 50 per cent because that was the ratio of the congressional appropriation of the preceding year as compared with the total District expenditure.[3] The fiscal feature of the house bill was retained in the measure substituted for it in the senate as well as in the conference bill that was enacted into the law of June 11, 1878, providing, as the title read, for a permanent form of government.

---

[1] After a service of six months Blow resigned. In his place Seth L. Phelps was appointed. As commander of a vessel in the volunteer navy during the civil war he had been associated with Grant in his western campaign. Ketcham resigned after serving three years, and Thomas B. Bryan, a lawyer and real estate operator of Chicago, was appointed by President Hayes.

[2] Executive Journal, Senate, May 20 and June 18, 1874.

[3] *The Star*, June 23 and 24, 1874.

[4] *New York Tribune*, Jan. 24, 1877. The paper was sold by John W. Forney to a company of which Harlan was the principal figure. The publication ended in January, 1877.

[5] *The Chronicle*, June 24, 1874.

---

[1] *The Nation*, 18, 406, June 25, 1874. In the single detail of a clerical force a contrast was early shown, as the number of District employés was reduced from 371 to 133. 44th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 702, Jan. 26, 1876.

[2] Conversation with Dr. William Tindall, who at the time was secretary to the governor.

[3] *New York Tribune*, Nov. 10, 1876.

[4] The unveiling of a statue to the memory of Alexander R. Shepherd. Washington, 1909.

---

[1] 44th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 702, p. 3, June 26, 1876.

[2] *The Star*, June 9, 1874.

[3] During the final discussion in the house a challenge to produce a plan for such a government was not answered. *Record*, p. 2114, March 28, 1878.

[4] The same, p. 1203, Feb. 12, 1875.

[5] *The Nation*, 20, 5, Jan. 7, 1875.

At this stage, just as had been the case with the committee of the previous congress, the principle of a definite rather than indefinite rate met with general acceptance in congress. The point was not argued or contested. What was said on the subject was designed merely to be explanatory of the reasons for having some fixed sum rather than an indefinite payment from the federal treasury. The former, it was explained, tended to give more certainty to District finances as well as save the time of congress, as it would not be necessary to determine each year how much to appropriate.[4] It is quite apparent, however, from the debate in 1878 that the half-and-half rate met with favor from a number, because of the impression or belief that the value of the federal property in the District was about one-half of the entire property valuation. No statement was given upon which such a conclusion was based. The same was true in the case of a similar claim made by the citizens of the District, as represented by a committee of one hundred, in a memorial presented to congress at the opening of the session in December, 1877. Only the total of government property valuation was given in the memorial, — nothing to show how it was arrived at. As the total was the same as the estimate made by Governor Shepherd in 1873, when he included the value of the street area at so much per square foot, it may be concluded that the committee adopted his figures. Moreover Shepherd was a member of the committee.

---

[1] 43d Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. 479, Dec. 7, 1874.

[2] *Record*, p. 2528, April 15, 1878. The value of public property, excepting the streets, was estimated at $66,267,000, while private property was assessed at $96,000,000. 44th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 33, Feb. 2, 1877.

[3] The same, p. 1926, March 20, 1878.

[4] The same, pp. 1922, 1926, 1927, March 20; p. 2112, March 28; and p. 2537, April 15, 1878.

The memorial gave a review, based upon the reports of subcommittees, of the history of the District and its present needs and condition, as the foundation for the contention that, as the District was the national capital where the government had large property interests as well as supreme authority, it should bear an equal share with the citizens in its maintenance and improvement.[1] With a singleness of purpose not always possible in civic efforts this committee had but one thing to ask, but one recommendation to make, and that was the adoption of the half-and-half rate. The zeal and earnestness with which the committee urged this matter is indicated by a remark made on the floor of the house that the change in the rate of 40 per cent, as proposed in the plan reported at the previous congress, to 50 per cent "was doubtless under the pressure of the committee of one hundred citizens."[2]

As was the case in 1874 when direct government was assumed, so in 1878 the pressure of necessity was a strong factor in bringing about the adoption of such an adjustment. For in fixing the rate of federal contribution the needs of the District were the primary consideration. In addition to existing obligation there were new ones, arising from the necessity for replacing miles of wood pavement that had turned out to be worthless.[1] The fiscal phase dominated the situation only during the latter period of the discussion. At the outset federal assumption was imperilled because, in doing away with the franchise privilege entirely, the negro would lose his vote. Just at that time the Republican party, still dominant in congress, was more than usually sensitive about negro voting because it had not turned out very well in the southern states and its opponents were making political capital out of it. At once suspicion was directed against the District measure, that it was intended mainly as a mere expedient to strike a blow at negro suffrage.

---

[1] The committee of one hundred citizens of the District of Columbia to the senate and house. Washington, 1877. Also Reports of subcommittees in separate pamphlet, same date and place.

[2] *Record*, p. 2528, April 15, 1878. The officers of the committee were: permanent chairman, George W. Riggs; vice-presidents, Joseph Casey, L. J. Davis, D. K. Carrter, John T. Given, C. S. Noyes and John T. Mitchell; secretary, John A. Baker; treasurer, R. C. Fox.

But quite independent of the negro, an element among the citizens stood out for some representation in the government that was to be placed over them. In this particular the line was drawn just where it was during the movement in 1868 to secure a commission government.[2] Then as now those who were not opposed to parting with the franchise under existing conditions were, generally speaking, the substantial citizens. The investigating committee of 1874 recognized the delicacy of the situation when it recommended a plan of government that did away with all suffrage. For it tactfully observed that in taking away from the people any part in the government it was not meant "to preclude the idea [when a permanent form was devised] that there should not be some representative body in the District."[3] But when at the next session the joint commission favored a continuance of the same sort of government, the barest recognition was given to the franchise by making the only elective offices three of the eight members of the school board. It was then that Oliver P. Morton of Indiana, the radical leader in the senate, declared that the sole purpose of doing away with the franchise in the District was to get rid of negro suffrage.[1] The failure of the District government bill to become a law at the session of 1875 was attributed by Senator Allan G. Thurman of Ohio, a member of the 1874 investigating committee, to the opposition of the suffrage party.[2] But in the next congress the most vigorous opposition to the omission of the franchise came from Senator George E. Spencer of Alabama, a northern man who settled in the south after the war. He said nothing about the negroes, but based his objection to a commission government on the ground that it gave no voice to the people in the selection of those who were to manage their affairs.[3] After the close of the 43d congress in March, 1875, the negro drops out of the discussion, reflecting a change in the country on this question. For at the fall election in 1874, a few months after the temporary commission government went into effect, popular disapproval of the southern policy of the dominant party resulted in the loss of control of the house which it had had since the breaking out of the civil war. At this time also the cause of suffrage in the District was given a serious set-back, when members of the only elective body in the territorial government, the house of delegates, took away with them, when they left the chamber for the last time at the close of that government, various articles of the furnishing and furniture of the room. Others sent back for things, and so generally was it done that the room was well cleared out. A touch of the ludicrous was given to this performance when one of the delegates walked away with a feather duster sticking out from his pants' leg. He achieved for that body the distinction of going down in history as "the feather-duster legislature."[4] What gave an added touch to the farce of such a representative body was the adoption, only a few days before, of a report opposing a commission government and asserting that "the present government is good so far as it is controlled and controllable by the people and bad when it is controlled by officials not of their choice or responsible to them."[1] The plan of the second joint committee appointed by a Republican senate and a Democratic house at the session of 1875–1876 did not even make the slight provision for the exercise of the franchise that the previous plan did.[2] However, this plan was not discussed, as the attention to District affairs, during the long session, was mainly given to correcting defects in the commission government that had then been in operation about a year and a half. Irritation as well as alarm was expressed in congress when it was found that several millions in 3.65 bonds had been issued in excess of what was supposed at the last session would be sufficient. Although the bonds could only be issued as the result of the joint act of two federal bodies, the commissioners and the audit commission, composed of the two comptrollers of the treasury, yet fraud was suspected. This was the attitude of five of the eleven members of the house District committee that investigated the matter. The indignation of this minority led them to turn over the evidence[3] to the attorney-general. The latter gave as his opinion that the commissioners had acted in good faith in circumstances where there was a difference as to their duties.[4] A good deal of the heat displayed in the committee and in congress over this matter may be attributed to the feeling about the 3.65 bonds, especially because of a suspicion that congress was being used as a market factor in their fluctuation.[5] It was even publicly charged that votes were corruptly secured for the permanent commission bill, because that measure made the interest on those bonds a District expense to be shared, as all other such expenses, equally by the general government and the

---

[1] Commissioner's Report, 1878, p. 3.

[2] *Baltimore Sun*, July 6 and Dec. 17, 1874; *The Star*, April 11; and *Baltimore Sun*, April 27, 1876.

[3] Investigation, 1874, Vol. 1, p. xxviii.

---

[1] *Record*, p. 120, Dec. 17, 1874.

[2] The same, p. 716, Jan. 28, 1876.

[3] 44th Cong., 2d Sess., Sen. Doc. No. 572, Jan. 11, 1877.

[4] *The Star*, June 23 and 24, 1874.

---

[1] *The Star*, June 3, 1874.

[2] *New York Tribune*, Dec. 28, 1876.

[3] 44th Cong., 1st Sess., House Miscella. 103, Feb. 23, 1876. The same, House 702, June 26, 1876.

[4] The same, Ex. Doc. No. 26, Jan. 19, 1877.

[5] *Record*, p. 596, Jan. 24, 1876.

District.[1] One result of the investigation of 1876 was a wise provision repairing an obvious omission in the temporary commission law, placing a limit on the issue of the bonds. In addition it made it a penal offence to increase the District debt.[2] The irritation over this matter explains in part the motive for the requirement placed on the District to meet the entire interest charge from its own revenue.[3] However, the law also provided that in the event the funds were not sufficient, the money should be advanced from the federal treasury to be repaid by the District. In point of fact, the District funds were not sufficient and so the interest was paid by the United States for the two years remaining of the temporary commission government. After that, of course, the interest charge became a joint concern, as with all other District expenses, and was not subject to the yearly uncertainty which up to that time seemed to hang about the 3.65 interest appropriation. But no repayment was made by the District. Apparently it was forgotten. The attention neither of congress nor of the District officials was called to the matter for nearly forty years. Then by direction of congress the amount due was paid.[4] Occupied with such matters of District legislation, congress did not, until the close of the session in the summer of 1876, appoint a committee to prepare a plan of government. While that committee duly made its report at the next session, yet it was not considered, as congress as well as the entire country was in a state of suspense and uncertainty as to the outcome of the disputed presidential election. It was not positively known until Friday, the 2d of March, that Hayes and not Tilden would be declared to be the rightful occupant of the office. There was but little time to prepare for the inaugural ceremonies, which were held on March 5, as the 4th came on Sunday. Pennsylvania Avenue, from the treasury to the capitol, was hastily given a gala appearance by stretching lines across the street, from which were suspended flags. Local military and civic organizations formed an escort for the presidential party. In the evening there was a torch-light parade of political clubs and a reception given by an Ohio military company at Willard's Hotel, which President Hayes attended.[1] The following winter, at the first session of the new congress, a plan for the government of the District, reported from the house District committee in addition to preserving the main features of the last plan, gave expression to the feeling that prevailed in congress as well as among citizens that citizens should have some representation in the government as long as they paid taxes. So an elective council of twenty-four members was provided with, however, only negative powers. This section was stricken out from the bill as it came from the senate committee, but in order to recognize some principle of self-government, a delegate in congress was provided.[2] When, however, the bill was reported from the conference committee and as it became a law, all franchise provision had disappeared.

---

[1] 45th Cong., 3d Sess., House Doc. No. 44, Dec. 19, 1878.

[2] Stats., 19, 211, March 14, 1876.

[3] *Record*, p. 596, Jan. 24, 1876.

[4] 63d Cong., 3d Sess., House Doc. No. 1627, March 1, 1915. Also Stats., 38, 1142, March 4, 1915. The deferred payment was treated by congress as an old debt, and the half-and-half plan was applied as in the case of all indebtedness prior to 1878.

The form of government, as established by the law of June 11, 1878, and as it has been continued, was a commission with no franchise privilege and a fixed rate of federal contribution. It marked the culmination of the movement begun soon after the close of the civil war to provide a national centre fit as a place of residence and representative of the Nation. Shepherd's conception of the city as it ought to be, as well as the rapidity and boldness with which he tried to realize it, shaped and colored the entire result which was reached in the law of 1878.

The plan of improvements as carried out was almost as national in its scope and quality as that of the plan of the city. By piling up a great debt and raising the level of municipal provision for community needs, Shepherd created a situation which forced federal participation in local expenses. He had a freer hand in administration because of dissatisfaction in congress with the condition of the city. He had also the advantage of a pliant local legislature, largely the product of negro suffrage. The colored franchise was an element in the adjustment of 1878, for it served to reconcile public opinion both in and out of congress to the acceptance of that anomaly in American government — a voteless community. But while Shepherd was the motive power in bringing about the adjustment and the experiment of negro suffrage in the District, a contributing cause, it remains true to-day, as it was recognized to some extent nearly four decades ago, that without federal sharing the city could never be what it was intended and what has been demonstrated through the succeeding years to be the desire of the American Nation that it should be.

---

[1] *The Star*, March 5, 1877.

[2] *Record*, p. 3779, May 25, 1878.

The law of 1878 marks a distinct epoch in the history of the District and forms a fitting conclusion to a narrative that has traced its course from the beginning.

INDEX

A

Abbott, George J., school principal, II. 377; secretary of New England Society, 382 n.

Abbott, John, an incorporator of Georgetown Lancaster School Society, I. 484 n.

Abolition Society, II. 140, 143.

Acquia, Va., material from quarries at, used in public buildings of Washington, I. 169, 231, 411.

Acquia Creek, steamboat transportation between Washington and, I. 538–539, II. 102, 354. *See also* Aquia Creek.

Adams, John, first colored schoolteacher in District, II. 138.

Adams, John, President, I. 339, 341; visit of, to city of Washington (1800), 347–350; defeat of, in election of 1800, 374; arrival of, in Washington upon establishment there of seat of government, 376; message to congress upon first meeting in Washington, 378–379; levee held by, 382; appointments to District offices made by, in last days of administration, 401–403; departure of, from Washington, 404; changes made by Jefferson in appointments of, 409–412; account of, with national treasury for accommodation of his household, 417 n.

Adams, Mrs. John, impression made upon, by city of Washington, I. 354, 376.

Adams, John Quincy, I. 347; quoted in connection with question of government of District of Columbia, 444–445; at races of Washington Jockey Club, 610; President Monroe declines invitation to ball given by, II. 51; attends Monroe inaugural ball, 58; place of residence, 59; quoted on defective organization of departments, 68–69; journey of, from Washington to New York, 103–104; inaugurates western canal enterprise, 107; contest of, for right of petition, 143; opinion of, on territorial government for District, 158; *National Journal* organ for, 169; demonstration on election of, 171; inaugural ceremonies of, 171–172; social customs of, at White House, 179; conduct of, on retiring from office, 216.

Adams, Mrs. John Quincy, custom of making first calls not observed by, II. 48.

Adams building, II. 59.

Addison, Henry, mayor of Georgetown, II. 268, 353 n., 365 n., 486; effect of unpopularity of, 558.

Addison, John, I. 74, 81.

Addison, Colonel Thomas, I. 72.

Addison, Rev. Walter Dulaney, founder and rector of St. John's Episcopal Church in Georgetown, I. 88, 604, II. 186; school set up at Oxen Run by, I. 90; incorporator of Georgetown Lancaster School Society, 484 n.; vice-president of Bible Society of District of Columbia, 601 n.

Adelphi Theatre, II. 407.

Adlum, John, cultivation of grapes by, II. 193.

Admiralty, court of, for the Potomac district, I. 423–424.

Aerial Reporter, II. 422 n.

African Methodist Episcopal Church, II. 185.

African Repository, organ of American Colonization Society, II. 136.

Agricultural exhibitions, I. 596–597.

Agricultural Museum, first American agricultural journal, I. 596.

Agriculture, early extravagant methods of, in Potomac region, I. 49; report on conditions in and about district, by Thomas Johnson and Dr. Stuart, 171–173.

Ague, prevalence of, in early Washington, I. 376 n., 515.

Aldermen, deadlock in board of (1867), II. 564.

Alexander, Charles, Jr., appointed coroner in Alexandria County, I. 424.
Alexander, Columbus, attempt made to discredit, II. 624.
Alexander, J. A., quoted, I. 13.
Alexander of Hohenlohe, Prince, miraculous healer, II. 6.
Alexandria, Va., proposed by Jefferson as a meeting place of congress, I. 18 n., 32; church at, attended by Washington, 82; progress of, as a commercial centre, 93, 98–100; importance of, as a commercial centre indicated by chartering of Bank of Alexandria, 208; progress in growth of, 275; Library Company of, 301; newspapers in, 303, 369, 436, 586; practising physicians at, 324 n.; fortifications built at, 332; opening of theatre in, 334; Marine Insurance Company of, 337; visit of President Adams to, 349–350; population in 1800, 355, 356; celebration in, over discharge of members of additional army (1800), 386; session of circuit court of District in, 422, 424; President Jefferson entertained at dinner in, 423; banks of, 431, 535; voting qualifications in, 446; salary of mayor of, 468 n.; Sunday restrictions in, 489–490; measures of poor relief in, 540 n.; congressional discrimination against, in matter of a jail, 545; night watch established in, 548 n.; fire insurance companies in, 564; lodges of Masons in, 617 n.; population of, in 1820, II. 2 n.; congress provides for erection of jail in, 93; connection of, with western canal enterprise, 109–113; aqueduct at, 110, 112; difficulty over pier location, 114; Orphan Asylum in, 219; loss of banks felt in, 259; restoration of, to Virginia, 262–263; unrest in, due to economic conditions, 267, Confederate flag on Marshall House in, 473.
Alexandria and Falmouth Railroad, proposed route of, II. 132.
Alexandria and Washington Railroad, tearing up of tracks of, II. 615.
Alexandria Canal, appropriation for, II. 131.
Alexandria Canal Co., Virginia legislature subscribes for stock of, II. 263.
Alexandria County, creation of, by law of 1801, I. 401; commissioners appointed by president for, at time of retrocession, II. 262 n.
Alexandria Daily Advertiser, 369, 586; name changed to *Alexandria Gazette*, 586 n.
Alexandria Gazette, I. 369 n., 586 n., II. 173 n.
Alexandria Herald, I. 586, II. 173.
Alexandria Times, career of, I. 303.
Allen, Rev. Mr., school taught by, in Georgetown, I. 90.
Allen, Thomas, editor of *Madisonian*, II. 232, 280 n.
Almshouse, city, location of, II. 331.
American, The, tri-weekly newspaper, II. 409 n.
American Antislavery convention, II. 143.
American Archives, printed by Matthew St. C. Clarke, II. 252.
American Board of Foreign Missions, formation of, II. 199.
American Botanical Register, published in 1831, II. 28.
American Colonization Society, II. 136, 522.
American Congressional Temperance Society, organized, II. 223.
American Critic and General Review, II. 179 n.
American Daily Telegraph, II. 419.
American House, II. 59 n.
American Literary Advertiser, Washington weekly, I. 588 n.
American Mechanic, labor newspaper, II. 231.
American Mercury, II. 171.
American Organ, Know Nothings' newspaper, II. 424, 425, 426; discontinuance of, 443.
American Quarterly Review, I. 179 n.
American Spectator and Washington City Chronicle, II. 227–228.
American Statesman and Mechanics and Manufacturers Advocate, II. 234 n.
Ames, Fisher, cited concerning trading over permanent seat of government, I. 28, 42–43.
Amusement, places of, in war time, II. 495.
Anacostan Indians, I. 47.
Anacostia, suburban settlement, II. 370.
Anacostia bridge, II. 99.
Anacostia Bridge Company, I. 336, 492.
Anacostia Fire Company, II. 243.
Anacostia river and island, I. 47–48.
Analostan Island, efforts to remove mud bank below, I. 429–430, 496–497.
Anderson, Joseph, charter member of Columbian Institute, II. 29 n., 31.

Anderson, Robert, *Columbian Star* published by, **II.** 173 n.
Andrei, Giovanni, Italian sculptor employed on capitol, **I.** 454, **II.** 32.
Annals of Congress, published by Gales and Seaton, **II.** 176 n.
Annapolis, Md., efforts of people of, to secure permanent seat of government at, **I.** 5–6; meeting of congress at (1783), 12, 18; trade convention at, 30; dates of incorporation and of chartering of, 57.
Anthracite coal, growing use of, **II.** 114.
Antigambling movement, **II.** 433.
Antimasonic movement, **II.** 197 n.
Antislavery literature, effect of circulation of, **II.** 142, 143.
Antislavery sentiment, rising tide of, **II.** 141.
Apollo Press, the, **I.** 435.
Appeal, newspaper organ for Hugh L. White, **II.** 228, 229.
Appler, David, proprietor of Fountain Inn, **II.** 60.
Appleton, John, brother-in-law of James Greenleaf, **I.** 291.
Appropriation Map, Dermott's, **I.** 324.
Aqueduct, Alexandria, **II.** 110–112.
Aquia Creek, all-rail route between Washington and, **II.** 342, 347. *See also* Acquia Creek.
Arlington Hotel, **II.** 568.
Arlington Sheep Shearing, the, **I.** 597.
Armory, built by congress, **II.** 331.
Armstrong, John, secretary of war, **I.** 614.
Armstrong, Robert, congressional printer, **II.** 422, 425.
Army, assignment of, for duty at Washington, **I.** 385; unpopularity of, with Republicans, 386; liquor ration in, abolished, **II.** 223; return of, through Washington, after civil war, 539. *See* Militia.
Army and Navy Chronicle, **II.** 234 n., 282.
Arsenal, Washington, **I.** 527.
Art commission, first governmental, **II.** 42, 43 n.
Arthur, Rev. Michael, school started by, **I.** 382 n.
Asbury, Francis, first Methodist bishop in United States, **I.** 87.
Ascension Episcopal Church, date of erection, **II.** 285 n.
Ashburton, Lord, residence of, during northeastern boundary negotiations, **II.** 449.
Ashton, Henry, on first board of prison inspectors, **II.** 87 n.; member of Jackson central committee, 210 n.; appointed marshal of the District, 225.
Assembly, the first dancing, **I.** 292–293.
Assembly Presbyterian Church, date of erection, **II.** 285 n.
Assessment, total amount of, in Washington (1803), **I.** 469.
Associated Press, New York, **II.** 414.
Associated Reformed Church in Washington, **I.** 599–601.
Atlantic World, weekly paper started in interests of Aaron Burr, **I.** 585, 586, 588.
Attorney, corporation, **II.** 400, 430 n., 486 n., 562, 563 n., 600.
Atzerodt, Booth fellow-conspirator, hanged, **II.** 539.
Auction. sales of city lots in federal district, **I.** 150 ff., 159–161, **II.** 17–18.
Austin, Rev. David, activities of, in Washington, **I.** 407–408.
Auxiliary Guard, **II.** 403.
Avenues in Washington, naming of, **I.** 155, 512.

B

Babcock, Col. Orville E., commissioner of public buildings, **II.** 619.
Bache, A. D., member of Scientific Club, **II.** 328 n.
Bachelors, taxation of, by Maryland assembly (1765), **I.** 66.
Bacon, John, retrocession resolution by, **I.** 440, 442.
Baggott, James W., chief of police, **II.** 403 n.
Bagot, Mr., English minister, social events given by, **II.** 50.
Bailey, Dr. Gamaliel, editor of *National Era*, **II.** 380, 387.
Bailey, Gamaliel, Jr., **II.** 415 n.
Bailey, John, rise of, from government clerk to representative, **II.** 77.
Baily, Francis, pen pictures of District by, **I.** 272, 273.
Baker, Rev. Daniel, pastor of Second Presbyterian Church, **II.** 181.
Balch, Rev. Stephen B., Columbian Academy conducted by, **I.** 90; pastor of Georgetown Presbyterian Church, 83, **II.** 183, 186; library and school started under initiative of, **I.** 301; sermon delivered by, at first observance of Washington's birthday, 339; letters by, in de-

fence of infant baptism, 408; an incorporator of Georgetown Lancaster School Society, 484 n.; an incorporator of Columbian Library, 522 n.; secretary of Bible Society of District of Columbia, 601 n.

Ballandine, John, I. 68.

Baltimore, offer made by, to secure permanent seat of government, I. 36–37; date of creation as a market and port of entry, 57–58; growth of, and progress as a shipping port, 92, 93; trade of, contrasted with that of Georgetown and Alexandria, 98–100; advantages and disadvantages of, as federal seat, 107–108; yellow fever epidemic in (1797), 305; gas for street lighting adopted in, II. 16; Whig convention in, 253.

Baltimore Bank Road, II. 101.

Baltimore Clipper, circulation of, in Washington, II. 420–421.

Baltimore Daily Advertiser, I. 96.

Baltimore-Frederick Road, I. 63, II. 101.

Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, commencement in building, II. 115; contest over right of way, 115–116; opening of, 116; line to Washington begun, 116; celebration of opening of Washington branch, 117; opposition of, to Virginia Company, 349; resists taxation, 360; policy of, unfavorable to Washington, 543–546; refusal of, to conform to street level, 567.

Baltimore Sun, circulation of, in Washington, II. 420–421.

Band of United States Marine Corps, I. 371, 406, 606–607.

Bank of Alexandria, I. 208, 431, 535, II. 194.

Bank of Columbia, Georgetown, I. 222–223, 535, 536, II. 194, 195; refusal of, to discount the city paper (1799), I. 329.

Bank of Commerce, Georgetown, II. 493 n.

Bank of the Metropolis, Washington, I. 518, 536–537, 617, II. 194.

Bank of Potomac, I. 432–433, 535.

Bank of the Republic, II. 493 n.

Bank of United States, Philadelphia, plan of, attributed to Samuel Blodgett, Jr., I. 196 n.; branch of, established in Washington, 432; banks created to take place of, upon expiration of charter, 535.

Bank of United States, second, removal of, from treasury building, II. 67–68.

Bank of Washington, I. 433, 535–536, II. 194, 196, 493 n.

Banks, anxieties of, as to effect of the assumption of the government of the District, I. 431; establishment of private, in District, 432–433; creation of, about 1811, 535–538; loan from, for rebuilding capitol, II. 34; in White House section, 194; in Georgetown, 195; in District, 195; first savings bank, 195; renewal of charters, 257; congress tries to regulate, 257–258; suspension of, preceding civil war, 461.

Bank Square, failure of congress to sell lots on, II. 17; site chosen for city hall building, 18.

Banner of the Constitution, II. 234 n.

Baptist Church, in Potomac region, I. 87; progress of, in the District, 408–409, 604–605; Washington centre of activity of, II. 198–201.

Baptists, General Convention of, for foreign missions, I. 604 n., II. 198.

Barbecue given by Morris and Nicholson, I. 280.

Barclay, Dr. James T., founding of Christian Church due to, II. 190–191.

Barlow, Joel, I. 54, 240; takes up residence in Washington, 580; activities of, in Washington, 582–583; appointed minister to France, 583; death, 583 n.

Barlow, Mrs., owner of Kalorama, II. 8.

Barnard, F. A. P., member of Scientific Club, II. 328 n.

Barnard, Frederick, proprietor of Mansion House, II. 59 n.

Barnes, John, money for poorhouse provided by, II. 220.

Barney, Captain Joshua, I. 620; gallant conduct of, against British, 625–626.

Barron, Commodore James, I. 568 n.; duel of, with Decatur, II. 53–54.

Barry, James, Washington merchant, I. 247, 248, 292, 434, II. 189 n.; chosen to position of school trustee, but declines, I. 479; gift of ground and building to Catholics by, 603.

Barry farm, purchased by Freedmen's Bureau, II. 556.

Barry's Chapel, I. 603, II. 189.

Base-ball, revived interest in (1862), II. 495.

Bathing facilities, the first public, in Washington, I. 517 n.

Bayard, James A., Jr., publication of federalist newspaper in Washington announced by, **I.** 590.
Bayard, Samuel, clerk of Supreme Court, **I.** 370.
Bayard, Thomas F., damage to property of, paid for, **II.** 618.
Baylor, C. G., editor of *Cotton Plant,* **II.** 422 n.
Beall, Alexander, captain in Maryland Provincials, **I.** 66.
Beall, Brooke, **I.** 73.
Beall, George, original proprietor, **I.** 58–59, 83, 101, 109.
Beall, Lloyd, mayor of Georgetown, **I.** 275 n., 596 n.
Beall, Ninian, advancement of Presbyterian Church in Potomac region by, **I.** 82–83.
Beall, Thomas, **I.** 73, 109, 135 n., 137; an incorporator of Georgetown Mutual Insurance Company, 337.
Beall, Thomas Brooke, **I.** 101.
Beall's Levels, original patentee of, **I.** 50; location of tract, in regard to present city of Washington, 52–53.
Beatty, Charles, **I.** 101.
Beatty, Dr. Charles A., **I.** 324 n.
Beauregard, General, expected march of, on Washington, **II.** 473.
Beckley, John, clerk of house and librarian of congress, **I.** 426.
Beecher, Henry Ward, delegate to council of Congregational Church, **II.** 391; sentiment against, in Washington, 392.
Belair, estate of Joel Barlow, **I.** 582.
Bell, David, duel fought by, **II.** 55 n.
Bell, George, assistance of, in opening school for colored children, **II.** 137.
Bender, George, vice-president of New England Society, **II.** 382 n.
Benefit association, government clerks', **II.** 76.
Benevolent Society, Washington, **I.** 542 n.
Bennett, James Gordon, Sr., influence of, on letters from Washington, **II.** 178 n.
Bennings, William, **I.** 492 n.
Benton, Thomas H., on bank regulating, **II.** 257.
Bernard, General S., first head of United States Board of Improvement, **II.** 107.
Berret, James G., mayor, **II.** 393, 430, 456; loyalty of, questioned, 466; resignation of, demanded, 486–487; president of Washington Club, 608.
Berrien, John M., Ewell residence occupied by, **II.** 7 n.
Beverly, Robert, an incorporator of Georgetown Lancaster School Society, **I.** 484 n.
Bible Society of the District of Columbia, organization of, **I.** 601.
Bickley, Robert S., winner in Blodgett's hotel lottery, **I.** 229–230.
Billing, Mrs. Mary, school for colored children opened by, **II.** 138 n.
Birch, James H., chief of police, **II.** 403 n.
Birney, James G., Liberty Party candidate for president, **II.** 381.
Birney, Colonel William, appointed inspector for colored troops, **II.** 533.
Black Code, **II.** 513, 517.
Bladensburg, Md., development of, as an early centre of trade, **I.** 58; inclusion of, in federal district found impracticable, 134; duels on field at, **II.** 54, 55 n.
Bladensburg, battle of, **I.** 625–626; results in killed and wounded, 628; adverse comments on conduct of American militia at, 633.
Blagden, George, chosen school trustee, **I.** 479; director of Washington Bridge Co., 506 n.; vice-president of Howard Society, **II.** 217 n.
Blair, Francis P., editor of *Globe,* **II.** 225; influence of, on Jackson administration, 226; residence of, 227.
Blair, Montgomery, postmaster-general, residence burned by General Early, **II.** 534–535.
Blair and Rives, partnership formed, **II.** 226, 227; congressional reports published by, 412.
Blake, Dr. James H., **I.** 324; mayor of Washington, 468, **II.** 5, 12 n., 31, 161; quoted concerning Sunday markets, **I.** 488–489; mayor during impending British attack, 615; recommends creation of office of health officer, **II.** 11; charter member of Columbian Institute, 29 n.; on Monroe inaugural committee, 33; register of wills, 77 n.
Blake, John B., commissioner of public buildings, **II.** 301.
Blodget building, occupied by government bureaus, **II.** 67.
Blodgett, Samuel, Jr., **I.** 164; one of incorporators of Georgetown Bridge Co., 171; visits Boston to negotiate loan on city property, 187; account of career of, 187–189; buys tract of

land in District, 189; appointed superintendent in charge by District commissioners, 193–194; plan submitted by, for capitol building, 196 n.; additional investments of, in city lots, 204–205; lotteries organized by, 205–208; first president of Bank of Columbia, 223; loss of confidence of commissioners and of General Washington in, 226–227; the Federal Lottery No. 2, 227–230, 283–285, 288, 333–334; consideration of character of, 228; ruin of, by lottery scheme, 229–230; interest of, in a national university, 253; fire insurance company started by, 433, 563; imprisonment of, for debt, 553; funds for national university solicited by, 553–554; death of, 554; varying estimates of, 554 n., 555.
Blodgett Hotel building, bought for use of government, I. 528, 555 n., 631 n.; designed by James Hoban, II. 46; destroyed by fire, 247; government offices in, 247.
Blow, Henry T., President Grant appoints commissioner, II. 631; resignation of, 632 n.
Boarding houses, homes of congressmen in, I. 379–380, 518, 574; popularity of, II. 62.
Board of health, creation of, II. 12; discontinuance of, 460.
Board of public works, under Shepherd's rule, II. 597–607; opposition to, 603–605, 609; city improvements due to, 614–615; abolished, 631.
Board of trade, organization of, II. 542.
Boat line between Washington and Alexandria, I. 305.
Bohrer, Dr. B. S., II. 12 n.
Bollman, Enrick, emissary of Burr arrested for treason, I. 584.
Bomford, Colonel George, residence of, II. 8; member of art commission, 43 n.; on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.
Bond issues of 1872, II. 611.
Bonds, issue of, limited, II. 639–640.
Book, the first relating to District, written by Lear, I. 221–222.
Bookseller, the first, in Washington, I. 336.
Book-stores, early, I. 383, 435, 436.
Booth, John Wilkes, President Lincoln assassinated by, II. 537.
Borrows, Joseph, I. 408 n.
Borrows, Sarah, I. 408 n.
Boston, gas for street lighting adopted in, II. 16; office of Baptist mission board removed to, 198.
Boston Atlas, quoted, II. 275.
Botanic gardens, I. 514 n., II. 29, 326.
Botanical Society, formation of, II. 27.
Botanic Society, II. 77.
Boteler, Charles W., II. 365 n.
Boudinot, Elias, president of Continental congress, I. 10; quoted on location of permanent seat of government, 17.
Boundary Street, laying out of, I. 255.
Bourne, Sylvanus, I. 235.
Bowen, Sayles J., II. 365 n.; on board of police commissioners, 487 n.; as postmaster, favors negro suffrage, 548–549; colored candidate for mayor, 563; election of, 564; administration of, 564–568; defeat of, 567.
Bowen administration, city improvements during, II. 565–568, 588; futility and costliness of, 574; funds misused by, 622.
Bowie, Washington, Georgetown merchant, I. 593.
Boyd, Washington, member of surveying force of District, I. 299–300; tax collector and later treasurer of Washington, 421, 468, 469, 546 n.; succeeds Daniel Carroll Brent as marshal, 572 n.; retirement of, as marshal, II. 35.
Boyle, Cornelius, I. 583 n., II. 462.
Boyle, John, treasurer of Botanical Society, II. 27 n., 31.
Boyle, John, Democratic candidate for mayor, II. 292.
Brackenridge, W. D., botanic garden in charge of, II. 326.
Brackett, Robert, II. 262 n.
Brackinridge, Rev. John, Presbyterian minister, I. 232, 601, II. 185.
Braddock, General, routes followed by expedition of, I. 65–66.
Braddock's Rock, I. 65–66, 219.
Bradford, Colonel John, I. 81.
Bradley, Abraham, Jr., assistant postmaster-general, I. 350; impressions of city of Washington, 353–354; cited, 438; director of Washington Library Co., 521 n.; owner of Chevy Chase, 573.
Bradley, Joseph H., quoted on Samuel Blodgett, I. 555; prosecuting attorney in slave case, II. 387; corporation counsel, 562.
Bradley, Phineas, residence of, at

Clover Hill, I. 573; offices held by, II. 77.

Bradley, William A., charter member of Botanical Society, II. 27 n., 31; candidate for mayor, 165, 167; president of Patriotic Bank, 195; treasurer of Howard Society, 217 n.; on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.; as mayor, 254–255; protest of, relative to street improvement on Island, 286 n.

Branch bank of United States, II. 194, 195.

Branding, as penalty for crime, II. 83–84.

Breckinridge, John, attorney-general, cited, I. 507 n.

Breckinridge, John C., vice-president, residence of, II. 446.

Brent, Daniel, residence of, leased to Mr. Adams, II. 59.

Brent, Daniel Carroll, marshal of District, I. 411, 422; appointed colonel in District militia, 565; resigns from militia, 572.

Brent, George, I. 169.

Brent, John Carroll, work by, cited, I. 52, 85; secretary of Washington and Rockville Co., II. 344 n.

Brent, John H., delegate to first Democratic convention, II. 236.

Brent, Robert, I. 85; justice of the peace for Washington County, 411; length of service as mayor of Washington, 467; paymaster-general of army and judge of orphans' court, 467; elected school trustee, 479; president of Columbia Manufacturing Co., 529 n.; president of the Patriotic Bank, 537; an English observer's opinion of, 573–574; house built by, at Maryland Avenue and 12th St., 574; residence of, designed by Latrobe, II. 8–9; charter member of Columbian Institute, 29 n.

Brent, R. Y., suburban movement attempted by, II. 369.

Brent, William, I. 85, 411; secretary of Eastern Branch Bridge Co., 427; clerk of circuit court, 455, 555; chosen school trustee, 479; on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, II. 245 n.; long service as clerk of court, 439.

Brent, William L., charges brought by, against Judge Thurston, II. 436.

Brereton, Dr. J. A., catalogue of plants in Washington Guide by, II. 27; curator of Botanical Society, 27 n.; flora of the District compiled by, in 1830, 28; American Botanical Register edited by, 28; member of Columbian Institute, 31.

Brewer, John, quoted, I. 53.

Breweries in Washington, I. 291, 525.

Brick Capitol, 14th and 15th congresses held in, II. 33; appropriation made for lease of, for circuit court, 40; offices of circuit court, clerk, and marshal removed from, 81.

Bricklayers' organization in Washington, I. 598–599.

Bricks, importation of, from Europe, held to be unnecessary, I. 80 n. II. 189 n.

Bridge, congress provides for, across Tiber, II. 249.

Bridges, over Rock Creek, I. 189–190, 242–243, 359–360, 493; over the Potomac, 243, 491–493; the Upper and Lower, 336–337; across Potomac at foot of Maryland Avenue, 493, 497, 502, 505–507; projects for, over the Eastern Branch and the Potomac, 426–430; irritation in congress over discussion of Potomac bridge, 441; across Potomac below the Little Falls, 491–492; across the Eastern Branch, 492; over the Tiber, 531; destruction of, at time of British invasion, 626–627, II. 98; Upper and Lower, rebuilt, 98–99; across Eastern Branch, 99; Long Bridge rebuilt, 99, 129, 130; over Tiber, 321; disadvantages of toll bridges, 342–343, 345.

Briggs, Isaac, I. 164 n., 209, 240.

Brightwood race-track, II. 369.

British, holding up of the *Chesapeake* by, I. 568; manœuvres of, in Chesapeake and Delaware bays during War of 1812, 612 ff., 618; march of, on Washington and burning of public buildings, 618–628; destruction of private houses by, 627–628; subsequent danger from, but final retreat, 630; recovery of Washington from invasion, 631–632.

British government, legation building site purchased by, II. 620.

Broad Creek Church, I. 81.

Bromley, Joseph, school trustee, I. 479.

Brooke, Louisa R., treasurer of Georgetown Orphan Asylum, II. 219 n.

Brooks, Erastus, congressional letter-writer, II. 235 n., 415 n.

Brooks, Thomas, director of Y. M. C. A., **II.** 434 n.

Brown, Glenn, "History of the United States Capitol," cited, **I.** 194, 201; quoted, 195 n.

Brown, Dr. Gustavus, **I.** 324 n.

Brown, Jesse, hotel proprietor, **II.** 59, 61, 62.

Brown, Joseph F., on board of police commissioners, **II.** 487 n.

Brown, Rev. Obadiah B., pastor of First Baptist Church, **I.** 604, **II.** 199.

Brown, Mrs. O. B., directress of Female Union Benevolent Society, **II.** 220 n.

Brown, Dr. Samuel, **I.** 324 n.

Brown, S. B., on board of public works in Grant administration, **II.** 595.

Brown and Snowden, newspaper publishers, **I.** 369.

Brown's Hotel, Monroe inaugural ball at, **II.** 58; dinner at, in honor of first steam train, 117.

Browne, William M., editor of *Constitution*, **II.** 462 n.

Bryan, Thomas B., appointed commissioner by President Hayes, **II.** 632 n.

Buchanan, President, spends summer in cottage of Soldiers' Home, **II.** 311; inaugural ball for, 442; militia appointments made by, 464.

Bucknell, William, on board of directors of Georgetown Gas Co., **II.** 301 n.

Buckner, John, **I.** 408 n.

Builders' Exchange, **II.** 588–589.

Building activity after civil war, **II.** 587–589.

Building association, the first, in Washington, **I.** 433–434.

Building materials, securing of, for federal city, **I.** 231.

Building regulations, issue of, for Washington, **I.** 162–163; later changes in, 278.

Bulfinch, Charles, appointed architect of capitol, **II.** 36; First Unitarian Church designed by, 184; last work of, on capitol, 214 n.

Bullett, A. A., editor of *Republic*, **II.** 417.

Bulwer, Sir Henry, Clarke house occupied by, **II.** 450.

Burch, Samuel, second digest of laws of city corporation edited by, **II.** 11.

Bureau of printing and engraving, creation of, **II.** 540–541.

Bureau of Standards, on site of John Adlum residence, **II.** 193.

Burial-grounds in Washington, **I.** 335, 607–609, **II.** 312 n., 313, 314.

Burke, Edmund, suggests removal of government from District, **II.** 253.

Burnes, David, owner of property on site of federal district, **I.** 124–125, 128, 129, 133, 135 n.; opening of Pennsylvania Avenue postponed on account of crops of, 276; death of, 327; estate left by, 556; daughter of, married to John P. Van Ness, 570–571.

Burnes, Marcia, **I.** 570–571.

Burnes home square, John P. Van Ness builds residence on, **II.** 6.

Burr, A. DeV., member of Grant's police board, **II.** 581 n.

Burr, L. S., *Washington Sentinel* published by, **II.** 179 n.

Burr conspiracy, echoes of, in Washington, **I.** 584–586.

Burroughs, John, in government service, **II.** 542.

Burrows, Colonel W. W., first commandant of Marine Corps, **I.** 371, 406.

Business centre of city (1838), **II.** 196.

Bussard, Daniel, **I.** 484 n.

Butler, General B. F., fleeing slaves cared for by, **II.** 522, 523.

Bynum, Jesse A. duel fought by, **II.** 55 n.

C

Cabinet officers, salaries of, **II.** 70, 71 n.

Cabinet of the United States, The, early Georgetown newspaper, **I.** 367; objections voiced by, to marines at polling places, 373; end of, 434.

Cabin John Run creek, **I.** 274 n.

Caffray's Spring, Washington, **I.** 559.

Caffry (Caffray), Rev. Mr., minister of St. Patrick's Church, **I.** 232, 559 n.

Caldwell, Elias B., clerk of Supreme Court, **I.** 370; mentioned, 414 n.; president of canal company, 500; recording secretary of Bible Society of District of Columbia, 601; house of, occupied by Supreme Court after British invasion, 632; charter member of Columbian Institute, **II.** 29 n., 31; services of, in slave case, 134–135; assists in organization of American Colonization Society, 136.

Calhoun, John C., **II.** 169, 215; news-

paper organ for, 280, 281; as Tyler's secretary of state, 281.
California syndicate, property acquired by, **II.** 619–620; operations of, 621.
Calls, changes in etiquette of, made by Mrs. Monroe and Mrs. Adams, **II.** 47, 48.
Calvert, George, opinion of, on Jackson party policy, **II.** 211 n.
Calvert estate, hotel built by, **II.** 61.
Cammack, William, treasurer of Washington Horticultural Society, **II.** 194 n.
Campbell, George Washington, duel fought by, **II.** 55 n
Campbell, Rev. John N., becomes pastor of Second Presbyterian Church, **II.** 183.
Campbell Hospital, **II.** 539.
Canal, projected and begun, to connect Tiber and St. James creeks, **I.** 151, 191, 242; the Washington City, 242, 493–495, 499–501; built by Potomac Co. at Great Falls, 274–275.
Canal Lottery No. 1, **I.** 288.
Canals, period of building, **II.** 104–115; failure of, 122–132; viewed as business enterprise, 262–267.
Canal section, unproductive of revenue, **II.** 25.
Cannon foundry above Georgetown, **I.** 333.
Canova, sculptor, pupils of, employed in capitol, **II.** 32.
Canterbury, the, amusement house, **II.** 494 n.
Capellano, Antonio, sculptor employed in capitol, **II.** 32.
Caperton, Hugh, connection of, with code of 1872, **II.** 631 n.
Capitals, plan of having two, **I.** 16–17, 18.
Capitol building, advertisement of premiums for plans for, **I.** 187; plans submitted for, but not approved, 195–196; list of competitors, 195 n.; Dr. Thornton's successful plan, 197; ceremonies at laying of corner-stone of, 213–214; discharge of Hallet, and appointment of Hadfield to supervise work on, 241–242; question of location of executive departments relative to, 306–307, 308; progress of work on, 313; discussion of charge that plans of capitol were not Thornton's work, 315–318; question concerning vignette of, used by *City of Washington Gazette*, 317–318; appropriation for providing furniture for, 340; condition of, at time of first meeting of congress in Washington, 377–378; appropriations by congress for completion of, 449–450; length of time taken for finishing, 450; description of new south wing, 453-454; meeting places of senate, Supreme Court, and circuit court in, 454–455; condition of, in 1810–1812, 456; religious meetings in house of representatives, 606–607; criticism of unfinished state of, by editor of *National Intelligencer* (1813), 618; burning of, by British, 618, 627; erection of building as a temporary capitol, 636–637; rebuilding of, **II.** 32, 34; first meeting of both houses in new, 34; eastern entrance designed by Latrobe, 36; western entrance designed by Bulfinch, 36; paintings by Trumbull in rotunda, 42; account of conditions at, 43–45; Lafayette officially received in rotunda, 45; water-supply for, 65–66; sale of liquor prohibited in, 224.
Capitol grounds, improvement of, **II.** 37, 40–41.
Capitol Hill, desirability of, for public buildings, pointed out by L'Enfant, **I.** 136.
Capitol Hill Market, **I.** 487.
Capitol Hill Tavern, **I.** 292.
Capitol Park, beginning of, **II.** 619.
Capitol Square, beauty of, **II.** 40.
Carbery, Thomas, residence of, **II.** 6; member of city hall erection commission 79 n.; on first board of prison inspectors, 87 n.; candidate for mayor, 161, 162, 166–167; on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.
Cardello, Francesco, sculptor employed in capitol, **II.** 32.
Carlisle, James M., **II.** 365 n.; work of, as abolitionist, 387; as corporation counsel, 486 n.; opposition of, to court bill, 519.
Carnahan, Rev. James, of Georgetown Academy, **II.** 209.
Carr, Overton, original proprietor of land in federal district, **I.** 135 n.; charter member of Columbian Institute, **II.** 29 n., 31.
Carrington, Edward C., plan for protection of city due to, **II.** 465 n.
Carroll, Charles, of Duddington, family of, and land held by, **I.** 51–52.

Carroll, Charles, of Bellevue, mentioned, I. 573, 625; Washington house of, called Bellevue, 573.

Carroll, Daniel, appointed commissioner of federal district, I. 120–121; qualifications of, for position, 121–122; resignation of, from board of commissioners, 255.

Carroll, Daniel, of Duddington, house erected south of capitol site by, I. 164; pulling down of house of, by L'Enfant, 166–167; lots purchased of, by Greenleaf, 219; seizure by, of buildings put up by Morris and Nicholson, 280–281; characteristics of, 281 n.; hotel structure erected by, 312, 519; two houses erected on Delaware Avenue by, 343; president of Washington Bridge Co., 506 n.; prosperous financial condition of, 556; ground given by, for St. Peter's Church, II. 189; first president of Bank of Washington, 194.

Carroll, Rev. John, first Catholic bishop in America, I. 84–85; Georgetown College begun by, 90–91; officiates at dedication of new St. Patrick's Catholic Church, 605.

Carroll, William T., professor at Columbian College, II. 200 n.

Carroll Row, hotel in, II. 60.

Carrollsburgh, proposed settlement called, I. 59–60.

Carter, John, on Georgetown retrocession committee, II. 260 n.

Cartter, David K., opinion of, on municipal expenses, II. 506; chief justice Supreme Court, 518; on fugitive slave law, 519–520; on committee for city government plan, 572 n.

Carusi, Lewis, building erected by, II. 172.

Carusi's, inaugural balls at, II. 216, 236, 251 n., 269 n., 405, 416; post-office at, 285.

Casanove, Peter, mayor of Georgetown, I. 275 n.

Cass, Lewis, liquor ration in army abolished by, II. 223.

Cassin, T. M., first directress of Georgetown Orphan Asylum, II. 219 n.

Catholic Church, progress of, in the Potomac region, I. 84–86; first church edifice of, in District, 232–233; progress of, in Washington, 602–603.

Catholic Seminary, II. 207.

Catholic Sentinel, II. 234 n.

Catholic Total Abstinence Society, II. 395.

Cattell, William G., declines President Grant's appointment as commissioner, II. 631–632.

Causici, Enrico, sculptor employed in capitol, II. 32.

Causin, Nathaniel P., judge of orphans' court, Washington County, II. 77 n.

Cemeteries in District of Columbia, I. 335, 607–609; II. 312 n., 313, 314.

Census figures, of District in 1800, I. 355–356; of Washington in 1803 and 1807, 466.

Centinel and Country Gazette, I. 284.

Centinel of Liberty and Georgetown Advertiser, I. 284; lottery drawings announced in, 333, 334; notice in, of removal of seat of government to Washington, 357 n.; changed to the *Museum and Washington and Georgetown Advertiser*, 368.

Central Academy, II. 206, 207.

Central Hospital, II. 240 n.

Central Presbyterian Church, II. 382; date of erection, 285 n.; property occupied by Methodists, 393 n.

Central Tippecanoe Club, II. 255.

Centre House Inn, I. 517.

Centre Market, I. 486, 516; called Marsh Market, 487 n.; agitation for stopping Sunday market at, 488; circus tent in front of, II. 197; appearance condemned 334; legislation relating to improvement of, 335–336; work on, delayed, 489–490; work on, stopped by congress, 509.

Chain bridge across Potomac, I. 492, II. 99; Georgetown buys, 129, 130.

Chalmers, John, rope factory of, I. 527.

Champagne Club, II. 234 n.

Charles County, Md., original extent of, I. 45.

Charter of 1848, II. 288–291; system of taxation under, 290.

Chase, Rev. Ira, on Columbian College faculty, II. 200 n.

Chase, Salmon P., II. 491; protest of, against color discrimination on street cars, 530–531; Andrew Johnson sworn in by, as president, 538; interest of, in Y. M. C. A., 589.

Chase, Samuel, rise of, from government clerk to judge of orphans' court, Washington County, II. 77.

Chase, W. H., member of Grant's police board, II. 581 n.

Cheese, presented to President Jefferson, I. 576; presented to President Jackson, II. 220.
Chesapeake affair, I. 568.
Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, passenger boats on, II. 113–114.
Chesapeake and Ohio Canal bill, passage of, celebrated, II. 111.
Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co., I. 69, II. 106; congress makes stock subscription to, 107; connection of, with western canal enterprise, 109–113; commercial benefits expected from, 263–264; bond issue (1844), 264–265.
Chevy Chase, estate of Abraham Bradley, I. 573.
Child of Pallas, Baltimore weekly journal, I. 366 n.
Chipman, General Norton P., on committee for Grant inaugural ceremonies, II. 572 n.; elected delegate to congress, 598; quoted on responsibility of congress to city, 606–607.
Cholera, Asiatic, epidemic of (1832), II. 239.
Christ Episcopal Church, beginning of, I. 233; in 1800, 382; arrangement as to pew-holding in, 601; mentioned, 602 n., II. 186.
Christian Church, church for, II. 190–191.
Christian Statesman, II. 234 n., 422 n.
Chronicle. See *Daily Chronicle*.
Church building, era of, II. 181–191.
Church buildings, dates of erection of, II. 285 n.; proposal to erect, for national use, 394.
Churches, of upper Potomac region, I. 81; organization of first, in Washington, 232–233; in Washington in 1800, 382; period of development and expansion from 1801 to 1813, 599-606; and slavery, II. 390–394.
Church services in Washington in 1800, I. 382.
Church unity, expressions of, II. 435.
Churchyards as burial places, I. 607.
Cincinnati, Society of, I. 14, 25.
Circuit court of District of Columbia, I. 401; first meeting, and organization of, 413; sessions of, held alternately in Washington and Alexandria, 422; character of cases brought before the, 425; meeting-place of, in Washington, 455; first meetings of, after British invasion, 632; temporary room in capitol used as meeting-place of, in 1816, II. 37; last sitting of, in capitol, 39; brick capitol leased for use of, 40; salaries of judge of, 71; congress purchases rooms in city hall for use of, 81; relief from overburdening of, 89; abolition of, desired, 435, 439; replaced by supreme court of the District, 440, 518.
Circulating libraries in Washington, I. 436.
Circus, building known as the, II. 196.
Citizens' Compiler, II. 283 n.
Citizens' Line of omnibuses, II. 362.
City canal, incompletion of, II. 122–123; relief measures for, 124–128; congress appropriates money for improvement of, 323. *See* Western Canal Enterprise *and* Washington City Canal.
City corporation, first figures at inauguration, II. 236; railroads and, 357–361.
City election, national politics factor in, II. 561–562.
City government, discussion of, II. 160–167; qualification of voters, 162–164; ward boundaries, 164; partisan candidates, 165–167; ward changes by, 286–289; charter changes suggested by, 289–292; question of suffrage extension, 288, 289; under control of Know Nothing Party, 404; territorial form proposed for, 570, 574; problems of, 569–572, 574–579; new form of, in Grant administration, 592–595; political policy, 598; relation of, to federal government, *see* District government.
City hall building, Bank Square chosen as site for, II. 18; plans for building, 79; site agreed upon, 80; corner-stone of, laid, 80; financial difficulty in completing, 81; rooms in, purchased by congress, 81; offices located in, 81; joint ownership of, by general government and city begun, 81; quarters of patent office in, 247; Central Tippecanoe Club rooms in, 255.
City hall built by L'Enfant in New York City, I. 22, 26.
City hospital, II. 339, 340.
City Hotel, II. 59 n., 194, 445 n.; quarters of post-office department in, 247.

City improvements, II. 315–322, 328–345, 349, 552, 555; during Bowen administration, 565–566; under Shepherd rule, 600–607, 614, 615.

City lots in Washington, first sale of, I. 150 ff.; second sale of, 204–205; third sale of, 213; sale of, in 1800, 362; sales of, after removal of seat of government to Washington, 415–416; later sales of, 510–511.

City officials, property qualifications of, repealed, II. 562.

City of Washington Gazette, question of authorship of vignette of capitol used by, I. 317–318; cited, II. 18.

Civil war, preparations for, II. 472–477; conditions during, 481–486; panics during, 533–535; conditions following, 539.

Clagett, Darius, member of Washington Horticultural Society, II. 194 n.; dry-goods store of, 196.

Clark, Dr. George, II. 12 n.

Clark, Joseph, in charge of ceremonies at laying of corner-stone of capitol building, I. 213.

Clarke, Daniel, I. 414 n.

Clarke, J. W., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.

Clarke, Matthew St. Clair, on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, II. 245 n.; residence of, 252.

Clarke, Mrs. M. St. C., directress of Female Union Benevolent Society, II. 220 n.

Clay, Henry, I. 456; Decatur residence occupied by, II. 7 n.; influence of, on Monroe inauguration, 33; on accommodations for circuit court, 39; incident occurring during speech of, 41; bloodless duel of, with John Randolph, 54; newspaper organ of, 171, 232, 281; on slave trade, 385.

Clephane, James, II. 230.

Clephane, Lewis, business manager of *National Era*, II. 392; chairman of general committee at Lincoln inauguration, 535 n.; on committee for city government plan, 572 n.

Clephane, Lewis, and Co., publishers, of *Daily National Republican*, II. 462 n.

Clerks, government, 69 ff.; discussion of increase in salary of, II. 71–73, 75–76; office hours of, 74; vacations of, 74–75; regulation of morals and debts of, 75; benefit association of, 76; ability and attainments of, 77–78; exempt from military duty, 146.

Clerks of circuit court of District of Columbia, I. 413, 414, II. 89; location of office of, in Washington County, I. 414.

Clermont, voyage of the, I. 581.

Clover Hill, home of Phineas Bradley, I. 573.

Cluss, Adolf, address by, cited, I. 315; residence of, II. 620; removed from board of public works, 632.

Coale and Co., book-store of, II. 228.

Coal trade, II. 114, 264, 265, 352.

Coast defences, building of, I. 332.

Coast survey, building erected for, II. 316 n., 327.

Cobb, Thomas W., suggestion of, concerning building for circuit court, II. 40.

Cochran, George, and Co., publishers of *Washingtonian*, II. 397 n.

Cochrane, J. T., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.

Cockburn, Rear Admiral, commander of British fleet in War of 1812, I. 612, 618, 620, 626.

Code. *See* Laws.

Coke, Richard, duel fought by, II. 55 n.

Coleman, William G., Clarke house purchased by, II. 450.

Collins, John, competitor for premium for best plan of president's house, I. 195 n.

Colored men, participation of, in Lincoln's second inauguration, II. 535.

Colored people, schools for, II. 137–138, 379, 524–525; churches for, 187, 378 n.; refuge for, 521–524; rights of, on street cars, 529; conduct of, after receiving right of suffrage, 557–558; offices given to, 559; campaign of, for Mayor Bowen, 562–564.

Colored public school system, II. 524–528.

Colored regiment, first, opposition to, II. 532–533.

Colored school board, changed from federal to local body, II. 630 n.

Coltman, Charles, Central Presbyterian Church erected by, II. 382 n.,

Columbia Bank, II. 194–195.

Columbia Fire Company, II. 243, 279.

Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, II. 218, 337, 342; Amos Kendall gives house to, 370.

Columbia Lodge of Masons, I. 617 n., II. 197 n.

Columbia Manufacturing Company, Washington, I. 529–530.
Columbia Railway Company, annual dividend paid by, II. 616–617.
Columbia Road in Alexandria County, building of, I. 533.
Columbia Turnpike Company, II. 345.
Columbia Typographical Society, organization of, I. 598; wage scale fixed by, II. 229; temperance dinner of, 396.
Columbian, II. 179; bought by Benjamin Homans, 227.
Columbian Academy, Georgetown, I. 90, II. 207.
Columbian Advertiser and Commercial, Mechanic, and Agricultural Gazette, 370 n.
Columbian Agricultural Society of Georgetown, I. 596.
Columbian Association of Teachers, II. 377.
Columbian Chronicle, Georgetown newspaper, I. 224, 264, 284.
Columbian College, Baptist institution, II. 198, 199–202; city hospital placed in charge of, 340; preparatory school of, 378.
Columbian Fire Engine Co., Washington, I. 558.
Columbian Foundry, I. 333, II. 187.
Columbian Fountain, temperance tri-weekly, II. 397 n.
Columbian Gazette, II. 227, 228.
Columbian Harmony Association Cemetery, II. 314.
Columbian Horticultural Society, II. 193.
Columbian Institute, Washington, I. 514 n.; public grounds assigned to, for botanical garden, II. 29; incorporators of, 29 n.; as germ of Smithsonian Institute, 31; class of members, 77.
Columbian Insurance Company of Alexandria I. 564.
Columbian Library, Georgetown, I. 301, 522.
Columbian Mirror and Alexandria Gazette, early District newspaper, I. 95, 303 n.
Columbian Register II. 179 n.
Columbian Repository, Georgetown weekly, I. 587 n.
Columbian Star, Baptist publication, II. 173 n., 198.
Columbian Trades-union, formation of, II. 231.
Columbian Turnpikes, the company of, I. 532–533.
Colvin, Mrs. A. S., *Weekly Messenger* published by, II. 179 n.
Colvin, J. B., journalist and lawyer, I. 588–589; proposal of, to publish laws relating to District, II. 10.
Colvin's Weekly Register, I. 588.
Combs, J. J., II. 365 n.
Commercial Co., Washington, formation and career of, I. 528–529.
Commissioner of public buildings, office of, created, II. 34; Colonel Samuel Lane first, 35; Joseph Elgar, second, 35.
Commissioners of federal district, appointment of Thomas Johnson, Daniel Carroll, and Dr. David Stuart as, I. 120–122; dealings of General Washington and, with proprietors of lands wanted for federal city, 124–145; John M. Gantt appointed secretary and William Deakins treasurer, 145; sales of city lots by, 150 ff., 204–205, 213, 362, 415–416; duties of, supervisory, 163; compensation for services, 163 n.; headquarters of, in Georgetown, 165; troubles between L'Enfant and, 165, 169, 173 ff.; beginning of opposition to, 178–179; governmental powers of, exercised in issue of liquor license and opening of streets, 191–192, 285; closer attention to business of the city found necessary by, 193; experiment tried by, of appointing a superintendent in charge, 193–194; interest of, in Blodgett's lottery scheme, 205, 207, 208; retirement of Johnson and Stuart as, 211, 237; auditing of accounts of, 224; use of letter-head " Washington City " by, 226; repudiation of Blodgett's lottery scheme by, 228; appointment of Gustavus Scott and Dr. Thornton as, 237–238; new régime begun by, in the way of closer personal attention and more method, 238–239; resignation of Daniel Carroll and appointment of Alexander White, 255; controversy between Thomas Johnson and, over matter of waterfront lots, 256; troubles with the Greenleaf-Morris syndicate, 256–259, 279, 319 ff.; requested by Washington to live in the city, 287; troubles of, with Law over fee simple title to lots, 295; crisis reached in affairs between Morris and Nicholson and, 295–296; con-

troversies between Davidson and Walker and, 296–297; troubles of, with laborers, 322; decisions of, concerning use of reservations, 325–328; abolition of board, 417.

Commission form of government, established by law of 1874, **II.** 626 ff.; half-and-half plan under, 634–637; question of suffrage under, 637–642.

Commission government bill, **II.** 553.

Concordia Lutheran Church, **II.** 190, 283.

Cone, Spencer H., **I.** 605.

Congregational Church, organization of, proposed, **II.** 381–382; second attempt to establish, 390; interest in, 391; council of, 391; forecast of second dissolution of, 393.

Congress, efforts of different states to become permanent residence of, **I.** 2 ff.; idea of jurisdiction of, over its permanent seat, 7–8, 15–16; threatened by mutinous continental soldiers at Philadelphia, 8–11; removal of, to Princeton, Annapolis, Trenton, and New York, 11–12; hopes of the southern states regarding a site on the Potomac, 16, 29; plan for two capitals, 16–17, 18; last four years of the continental, spent at New York City, 22; removal of the new, to Philadelphia, 26, 27; trading in, over location of permanent seat, 28 ff.; final passage and provisions of residence bill, 38–39; power of exclusive legislation in federal district conferred on, 41; account of the bargain or compromise relative to site of permanent seat, 41–43; application to, for financial help for federal city, 259, 264–265; discussion of matter of loan by, and final passage of bill granting support, 266–270; observations of foreign travellers on indifference of, to prosperity of Washington city, 270; removal of, to Washington, 339; local observance of first assembling of, in Washington, 374–375; first meetings of, in capitol building, 377; accommodations for members of, 380; discussion of District government bill in, 397–398; passage by, of "act concerning the District of Columbia," 399–401; library of, 426, 636; troubles of, over local affairs of District, 440–442; retrocession resolutions voted down by, 441, 448; debates in, on retrocession resolutions, 444, 447–448; corporate government provided for Washington by, 445–446; appropriations by, for completion of capitol building, 449–450; complaints by citizens of District concerning shortcomings of, 473–474; discrimination shown by, in treatment of Washington and Alexandria, 545; standing committee of, on District of Columbia, 545–546; rejection by, of proposals to remove seat of government from Washington after burning of public buildings, 634–635; building erected for accommodation of (1815), 636–637; printing of laws of, relating to District, **II.** 11; attempts of, at street improvement, 16 ff.; decision by, to sell land owned by government, 17; importuned to improve reservations and open squares, 19; temporary structure built for use of, 37–38; salaries of members of, 70; appropriation by, for purchase of rooms in city hall, 81; decides to establish national penitentiary, 87; federal responsibility in local affairs acknowledged by, 129; debates of, published, 176–177; restores Alexandria to Virginia, 262; throngs in city during sessions of, 275; liberal policy of, regarding street lighting, 299–300; fixes gas-rate limit, 301; appropriation of, for water-supply, 306; and city improvements, 317 ff.; opposition of, to railroad enterprise, 349; Pennsylvania Avenue protected by, 357; legislation relating to reduction of printing rates, 409, 410; improvement in reports of, 411; asked to reorganize courts, 435; law enacted by, for federal police, 482; provisions of, for code for colored people, 521; legislation of, for colored people, 524–528; popular government of District abolished by, 611; provides annual appropriation bills for improvement of public grounds, 619; appoints committee to prepare plan of government, 640.

"Congress fund," benefits of, to Georgetown, **II.** 130.

Congressional Cemetery, **II.** 313.

Congressional Directories, **II.** 444, 445.

Congressional Globe, **II**. 226, 280. See also *Globe*.
"Congressional messes," **I**. 380.
Congressional Record, **II**. 412.
Congressional Temperance Society, **II**. 395, 580.
Congressional Total Abstinence Society, **II**. 395.
Congressmen, homes of, in Washington, **I**. 379–380, 518, 574; funerals and burial places of, 607–609.
Congress Street Methodist Protestant Church, **II**. 187.
Coningham, Dr., partner of Greenleaf in brewery business, **I**. 291, 323, 525.
Connolly, Thomas C., first editor of *Telegraph*, **II**. 419 n.
Connor, Mrs., case of, leads to discussion of jury power, **II**. 440.
Conococheague River and valley, **I**. 108, 113.
Conrad, Michael and John, booksellers, **I**. 595.
Conrad and McMunn, boarding house of, **I**. 379–380, 404, 407.
Constitution, Breckinridge organ, **II**. 455 n.; secession doctrines advocated by, 462.
Constitution, Calhoun's newspaper organ, **II**. 281; office removed to Baltimore, 408.
Constitution, daily newspaper, **II**. 418.
Constitution, frigate, phaeton built from wood of, **II**. 251.
Contrabands, care of, **II**. 521–524.
Contract printing law, **II**. 409–411.
Contract system, adoption of, by commissioners, **I**. 243.
Convention in retrocession movement, **II**. 259.
Convict labor system, congress sanctions, **II**. 87.
Conway, Moncure D., minister of Unitarian Church, **II**. 392.
Conway, Richard, **I**. 337.
Cook, John F. colored school teacher and minister, **II**. 137; head of negro suffrage society, 547; public service of, 559.
Cook, William A., corporation counsel, **II**. 563 n., 600 n.; on committee for Grant inaugural ceremonies, 572 n.
Cooke, Henry D., as financier, **II**. 491–492; territorial government favored by, 570; on committee for Grant inaugural ceremonies, 572 n., for city government plan, 572 n.; interest of, in Y. M. C. A., 589; Grant appoints governor, 595; vice-president of Washington Club, 608 n.; resigns as governor, 622.
Cooke, Jay, secures street railway charter, **II**. 491; bank enterprise of, 492.
Cooke, Jay, and Co., failure of, **II**. 621, 622.
Cooke, Samuel B., duel fought by, **II**. 55 n.
Coolidge, Samuel J., hotel keeper, **I**. 519 n.
Cooper, William, Washington bookseller and partner of Richard Dinmore, **I**. 588, 589 n.
Corcoran, Thomas, **I**. 101, **II**. 160 n.; appointed justice of the peace for Washington County, **I**. 410; mayor of Georgetown, 596 n.; residence of, **II**. 192; member of Jackson central committee, 210 n.; appointed assistant postmaster, 224 n.
Corcoran, W. W., **I**. 101; president of Washington Horticultural Society, **II**. 194 n.; Oak Hill Cemetery due to, 313; Webster's home purchased by, 449–450; Arlington Hotel built by, 568.
Corcoran Art Gallery, **II**. 450.
Corcoran Building, **II**. 316 n.
Corner-stone, laying of first, of District boundary, **I**. 142–143; laying of, of bridge across Rock Creek, 190 n.; of president's house, 204.
Corporate government provided for Washington, **I**. 445–446.
Corporation counsel. *See* Attorney.
Correa de Serra, José, **II**. 50.
Cosmos Club, Richard Cutts' residence home of, **II**. 8 n.
Cotton Plant, **II**. 422 n.
Council for city of Washington, election to, **I**. 466–467; meeting place of, in the capitol, 472; later meeting places, 472 n.; provides design for seal for city of Washington, 472; printing of ordinances of, 474; action of, in regard to provision for schools, 474–475; newspaper criticism of, 524; proposed dinner of, to District committee, abandoned, **II**. 9; creates office of health officer, 12; appropriation by, for providing trees, 13; appropriation for street lighting made by, 14–15; commission appointed by, to sell public lots, 22; commission appointed by, to superintend erection of city hall, 79; assembles in city hall, 80; action of, regarding fire companies, 278–279; discus-

sion of ward policy by, 286–289; new charter adopted by, 290–292; street-lighting policy of, 302; measures of, in temperance movement, 400–401; appropriation of, for needy families during war, 477.

Counties, along the Potomac River, I. 44–45; division of District of Columbia into, by law of 1801, 401.

Court-house, location of, II. 37; movement to raise money to erect, 38.

Court reform movement, II. 435, 439.

Court system, new, II. 517–521.

Courts, provided for District by law of 1801, I. 401; Jefferson's appointments to, and meeting and organization of, 412–414; levy court of Washington County, 420–421; United States district court for the Potomac district, I. 423–424; criticism of the, II. 435–442. *See also* Circuit court.

Coville, Frederick V., author of "Early Botanical Activity in the District," II. 27 n.

Cox, Clement, on Georgetown retrocession committee, II. 260 n.

Cox, John, mayor of Georgetown, II. 160 n., 353 n.

Cox, R. S., member of Columbian Horticultural Society, II. 193.

Cox, Walter S., II. 365 n.; commissioner under fugitive slave law, 520.

Coxe, Richard A., charges brought by, against Judge Thurston, II. 436.

Coxe, Richard S., prosecuting attorney in slave case, II. 387.

Coyle, John, Jr., secretary of Howard Society, II. 217 n.; secretary of Temperance Union, 223 n.

Coyle, John F., connected with street railway enterprise, II. 365 n.; President Johnson guest of, 573; one of owners of *Intelligencer*, 573 n.

Coyle, Randolph, street grades determined by, II. 308 n.

Cragin, C. H., member of Grant's police board, II. 581 n.

Craig, Benjamin N., member of Scientific Club, II. 328 n.

Craik, Dr. James, I. 324 n.

Cralle, Richard K., publishes *Reformer*, II. 229.

Cranch, William, I. 220 n., 221, 279, 415, II. 82 n.; appointed trustee of Greenleaf holdings, I. 321; associate judge of circuit court of District, 402, 413; service as commissioner of Washington, 413 n.; chief justice of circuit court, 455, 584; elected school trustee, 479; president of Washington Benevolent Society, 542 n.; honored career of, 556; sells Washington house and removes to Alexandria, 573; on commission to select penitentiary site, II. 88 n.; opinion of, on District government, 157; professor at Columbian College, 200 n.; president Temperance Society, 222; vice-president Temperance Union, 223 n.; opinion of, in case of Anne Royall, 233; vice-president Washington Monument Society, 245 n.; Judge Thurston and, 437; long term of, 438.

Cranch, Mrs. William, I. 349.

Cranch code of laws, II. 10.

Crandall, Dr. Reuben, trial of, II. 144.

Craven, John, I. 522 n., II. 76.

Crawford, Richard R., mayor of Georgetown, II. 353 n.

Crawford, Thomas H., judge of criminal court, II. 438, 518.

Crawford, William, hotel keeper, I. 520.

Crawford, William H., candidate for presidential nomination, II. 168; declines seat in Adams cabinet, 172.

Cresap, Captain Michael, I. 75, 76.

Crime, punishments for, II. 83–84.

Criminal court, creation of, II. 95; place of holding, 96.

Crittenden, John J., opposes President Tyler's proposed police guard, II. 273.

Crocker, Dr. John, I. 232 n., 283; close of career of, 323–324; house of, 350.

Crommelin at the Great Falls, city water-supply inaugurated at, II. 307.

Cross, William B. B., work of, on code of laws, II. 439.

Cruikshank, Richard, on board of directors of Georgetown Gas Company, II. 301 n.

Crutchett, James, experiments of, with gas, II. 296.

Cullum, Shelby M., territorial bill introduced in house by, II. 576.

Cumberland, Md., beginnings of, I. 64.

Cummins, Ebenezer H., newspaper publisher, I. 595–596.

Cunningham, A. F., publisher of *Washingtonian*, II. 231.

Cunningham, Ann P., suburban land purchase of, II. 371.

Cuppy, Fletcher P., Recorder of Deeds, II. 521 n.

Curran, W. W., **II**. 230.

Currency, District paper as, **II**. 612–613.

Cushing, Caleb, editorials in *Union*, **II**. 425.

Custis, George Washington Parke, oration delivered by, at funeral services of James M. Lingan, **I**. 593; Arlington Sheep Shearing held under auspices of, 597; pamphlet by, on possibilities of improvement in use of land, 597; mentioned, **II**. 262 n.; orator at laying of Jackson City corner-stone, 250.

Cutbush, Dr. Edward, charter member of Columbian Institute, **II**. 29 n., 30, 31.

Cutler, Rev. Manasseh, "Life," cited and quoted, **I**. 576, 600, 606, 607, 608, 610.

Cutting, Nathaniel, charter member of Columbian Institute, **II**. 29 n., 31.

Cutts, Richard, **I**. 629; residence of, **II**. 8; residence bought by Mr. Adams, 59; residence occupied by Mrs. Madison, 252.

D

Daily Bee, **II**. 409 n., 419.

Daily Chronicle, **II**. 463, 632.

Daily Constitutional Union, Democratic organ, **II**. 463.

Daily Fountain, temperance paper, **II**. 397 n.

Daily National Republican, **II**. 443 n., 462, 463.

Daily Patriot, Democratic party organ, **II**. 463.

Daily Times, **II**. 408, 463 n.

Dalton, Tristam, **I**. 221; address to President Adams by, 348–349; appointed to board of city commissioners by President Adams, 415.

Dana, Charles A., Alexander R. Shepherd brings libel proceedings against, **II**. 623 n.

Dancing assemblies in Washington, **I**. 292–293, 381.

Danforth, Rev. J. N., Second Presbyterian Church and, **II**. 182.

Daniel, John M., Jr., **I**. 484 n.; duel fought by, **II**. 55 n.

Darnall, Henry, early landholder, **I**. 52.

Darnall, Thomas, **I**. 55.

Daveiss, Joseph H., Federalist, and United States district attorney of Kentucky, **I**. 585.

Davidson, James, cashier of Washington branch of Bank of United States, **I**. 432.

Davidson, Samuel, **I**. 144, 146; first protest of, against alleged changes from L'Enfant's plan, 296; residence of Evermay owned by, 573.

Davis, Gideon, bookseller, and librarian of Washington Library, **I**. 522.

Davis, H. S., president of Jackson Democratic Association, **II**. 271 n.

Davis, James N., newspaper publisher, **II**. 409 n.

Davis, John, chief of police, **II**. 403 n.

Davis, John, hotel keeper, **I**. 517 n.

Davis, John, proprietor of Indian Queen Hotel, **II**. 59.

Davis, Maria W., secretary of Georgetown Orphan Asylum, **II**. 219 n.

Davis, S. G., duel fought by, **II**. 55 n.

Davis, William A., District laws collected and printed by, **II**. 11; congressional printer, 170.

Davis' Columbian Calendar, **I**. 617, **II**. 170 n.

Davis and Force, book-store of, 170.

Davis Hotel, **II**. 14; gas introduced into, 16; Monroe inaugural ball held at, 33 n.

Davis Tavern, 517 n., 635, 636.

Dawes, William, publishes *Washington Mirror*, **II**. 229.

Deakins, Francis, **I**. 74 n., 77, 337; chairman of committee to receive President Adams, 348.

Deakins, Leonard, **I**. 74 n., 77.

Deakins, William, **I**. 73, 74, 75, 78.

Deakins, William, Jr., **I**. 74 n., 104, 109; correspondence of Washington with, relative to location of federal city, 123, 125, 127, 128; chosen treasurer of board of commissioners of federal city, 145; one of incorporators of Georgetown Bridge Co., 171; interest of, in Blodgett's lottery scheme, 205; an incorporator of Bank of Columbia, 223.

Dearborn, Henry, secretary of war, house occupied by, **I**. 406.

Death rate (1820–1830), **II**. 13 n.

Debates, custom among visitors to hear, in senate, **II**. 41; congressional, reporting and publishing of, 176–177, 280.

Debt, congress assumes canal, 249; of city under Shepherd rule, 609–610, 611–617, 621–625.

Debtor law, relief from, **II**. 89–91.

Decatur, Commodore Stephen, killed in duel, **II**. 53–54.

Decatur residence, **II.** 6–7; occupants after owner's death, 7 n.; bought by John Gadsby, 445 n.

Deeds of trust executed by original proprietors of District land, **I.** 145.

DeKraft, F. C., appointed surveyor of the city, **II.** 2 n., 3.

Delano, Judah, Washington Directory issued by, **II.** 27 n.

Delaware River, proposal to locate permanent seat of government on the, **I.** 16–17.

De Leon, Edwin, editor *Southern Press*, **II.** 418 n.

Democratic party, first convention of, **II.** 236; printers for, 168.

Dempsie, John, chosen school trustee, **I.** 479.

Deneale, George, appointed clerk of circuit court for Alexandria County, **I.** 413; clerk of United States district court for the Potomac district, 423.

Denison, Charles W., publisher of *Saturday Evening Mail*, **II.** 426 n.

Dennison, William A., President Grant appoints as commissioner, **II.** 631.

Dent, George, marshal of the Potomac district, **I.** 423.

Departmental buildings, inadequacy of, **II.** 67–69.

Departments, question of location of, in capital, relative to capitol building, **I.** 306–307; removal of, from Philadelphia to Washington, 350–353; expenses incurred by employés of, for removal to Washington, 352–353; defective organization of, **II.** 68–69.

Depot, discussion over site of, **II.** 357–358, 359.

Dermott, James R., surveyor employed at Washington, **I.** 210 n., 211, 240; discharge of, 300.

Detroit, influence of Washington plan shown in laying out of, **I.** 210 n.

Dick, Dr. E. C., **I.** 324 n.; appointed coroner in Alexandria County, 424.

Dickson, William, in command of first steam fire-engine, **II.** 483.

Digest of laws of corporation issued, **II.** 11.

Digges, William Dudley, L'Enfant's last years spent at home of, **I.** 183.

Digges Point, purchase and occupation of, by United States government, **I.** 569–570.

Dinmore, Richard, boarding school opened by, **I.** 336; newspapers published by, 368, 586; "Select and Fugitive Poetry" by, 435 n.; issues *Washington Expositor*, 588; death of, 588 n.

Diplomatic corps, in Jefferson's administration, **I.** 574; absence of, in season of 1814–15, 630; reception of, on New Year's Day, **II.** 49; change of social intercourse of, with president, 50; countries represented by, in 1816, 50 n.

Directory, first general, issued, **II.** 27.

Disciples of Christ, meeting of, **II.** 190–191.

Dispensary, opening of, **II.** 340.

District attorney, **I.** 402, 411, 412, 424 n., 584, 585, **II.** 8, 273, 387, 431, 520.

District bank legislation, **II.** 257–258.

District of Columbia, choice of, for permanent seat of government, **I.** 17, 38–40; description of region of, 44–70; location of, by President Washington, 119–120; commissioners appointed for, 120–123; survey of, and purchase of lands for, 123 ff.; announcement of bounds of, and objections of original proprietors to extent of, 137–139; laws enacted by Maryland relating to (1791), 169–171; commissioners' report on agricultural conditions in and about, 171–173; first law relating to, to be enacted by Virginia legislature, 208; census statistics for, in 1800, 355–356; problem of form of government for, 378–379, 387–401, 439–445, 463 ff.; provisions of law of 1801, 400–401; division of, into Washington and Alexandria counties, 401; abolition of board of commissioners, 417, 450; retrocession of, advocated as a solution of political problem presented by, 440–448, 463–464; territorial form of government proposed for, 442, 443, 445, 447; distinction kept clear between form of government for, and for the towns in the District, 473–474; appointment of congressional standing committee on the, 545–546; senate creates standing committee on the, **II.** 9; Cranch code of laws for the, 10; old English and colonial laws of, disregarded by judges, 10; affairs of, discussed in annual presidential messages, 63; judicial system of, unsatisfactory, 82; court of, hampered by obsolete laws, 82–83; recognized as vantage point for educational campaign, 92; attempt made to secure code of laws for, 94; severity of old criminal laws mitigated, 95; congress restricts gambling in, 95; debt relief measures for, 124–128; government for, discussed, 150–160; discussion of use of public money for, 253; retrocession movement in, 259; charities in, 337–342; internal improvement in, 342–356; slave trade in, 384–388; need of militia in, emphasized, 452; political sympathies in, 454–455; federal police provided for, 459; militia in, organized, 464–465; militia organizations of, mustered into service, 474–475; civil and military government in, 476–477, 480; banks in, 493 n.; debate on emancipation in, 521–522; importance of, in national politics, 572; congress abolishes popular government of, 611; bankrupt, 622–628. *See* Washington, D. C.

District committee, proposed dinner of city council to, abandoned, II. 9; report of, favoring taxation of government realty holdings, 25–26.

District court, United States, for the Potomac district, I. 423–424.

District delegate, office of, proved disappointing, II. 631.

District delegates, voting privilege at convention, II. 236–237.

District government, interwoven relations between federal government and, II. 10–11, 19–20, 63–64, 86–87, 89–90, 97, 107, 123, 124, 127, 128, 132–133, 150–157, 241, 248, 253–263, 318–320, 331, 337, 498–499, 511–513, 569–579, 625, 634, 641; and negro suffrage, 546 ff.; Lot M. Morrill's proposal for, 550–551, 552; conflicting authority in, 560–561.

District laws, old English and colonial, disregarded by judges, II. 10; first digests made, 11.

District National Guard, II. 147.

Dix, Dorothea L., II. 339.

Doctors, the earliest, in Washington, I. 324.

Dodge Robert P., on board of directors of Georgetown Gas Company, II. 301 n.

Dodler, John, one of Union Land association promoters, II. 370 n.

Donelson, Andrew Jackson, relations of, with President Jackson, II. 250; *Union* owned by, 422, 425.

Doorkeepers of congress, houses given over to use of, I. 487.

Dorsey, Joseph, trustee of Central Presbyterian Church, II. 382 n.

Dorsey, William H., I. 299; member of committee to receive President Adams, 348; judge of orphans' court, Washington County, 403, 414; succeeded as judge of orphans' court by Robert Brent, 467.

Douglas, Stephen A., cited on inadequate police protection, II. 431; Kansas pro-slavery constitution denounced by, 442; residence erected by, 446.

Douglass, Frederick, opposition to lecture of, on negro suffrage, II. 547–548; recognition of, by President Grant, 599.

Douglass, John, florist, II. 193 n.

Dow, Jesse E., secretary of New England Society, II. 382 n.; candidate for mayor, 388; newspaper owner, 408 n.

Downing, A. J., landscape gardener, II. 324.

Doynes, Mrs., boarding-house keeper, I. 580.

Dranesville, Lee's army reaches, II. 533.

Drayton, Daniel, runaway slaves assisted by, II. 385–386.

Drew, Columbus, newspaper publisher, II. 409 n.

Duane, William, book-store and printing office of, I. 435, 436, 516, 595; mentioned, II. 168.

Duckett, Allen B., appointed associate judge of circuit court of District, I. 455.

Duddington's pasture, original patent for, I. 49; later ownership of, 50–51.

Duels fought in vicinity of District, I. 321; popular feeling aroused by, II. 54; congress passes law prohibiting, 55; fought on field of Bladensburg, 55 n.

Dulton, G. W., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.

Dumbarton Avenue Methodist Church, I. 87.

Duncan, Thomas, instrumental in organizing Y. M. C. A., II. 434; as director, 434 n.

Duncanson, J. A. M., printer of *American Botanical Register*, II. 28 n.

Duncanson, William Mayne, investor in Washington real estate, I. 245; house built, lots purchased, and unsuccessful business established by, 293; losses of, through Green-

leaf syndicate, 321–322, 556; ferry kept by, 501 n.
Dunlop, James, I. 102, 337; on first board of prison inspectors, II. 87 n.; second judge of criminal court, 96; President Polk appoints associate District judge, 438; appointed chief judge, 438.
Dunlop, R. P., on Georgetown retrocession committee, II. 260 n.
Dunlop's Maryland Gazette, I. 96.
Dunn, James C., *National Messenger* published by, II. 178; *American Spectator and Washington City Chronicle* published by, 227 n.
Dupont Circle, speculative movement in vicinity of, 620.
Dusenbury, C., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.
Duvall, Gabriel, elected school trustee, I. 479.
Dwight, Rev. Dr. Louis, influence of, on prison conditions, II. 92.
Dyson, Captain S. T., I. 630.

E

Early, General, engagement of, near Washington, II. 534; burns residence of Montgomery Blair, 535.
East Capitol Street, opening of, by Washington city government, I. 523.
East entrance, designs for tympanum of, II. 43.
Eastern Academy, Washington, opening of, I. 481–482; location of, and cost of building, 482; proclamation of prosperity of, II. 206.
Eastern Branch, early estimate of value of, as a harbor and place of trade, I. 151; project for bridge across, in 1801, 426–427; construction of Lower and Upper bridges, 492; destruction of bridge across, at time of British invasion, 626; value of terminus for coal trade on, II. 265.
Eastern Branch Bridge, II. 98, 99.
Eastern Branch Bridge Co., I. 427.
Eastern Branch Hotel, I. 292, 310.
Eastern Branch Market, I. 486.
Eastern Hospital, II. 240 n.
Eastern School, II. 204.
East room, use of, at Adams reception, II. 181; furnishing of, completed, 238.
Eaton, General John H., appeal of, for improved city conditions, II. 20; O'Neale hotel property owned by, 60–61; marriage, 61; secretary of war, 61; connection of, with *Gazette*, 173.
Eaton, Mrs. John H., Rev. Mr. Campbell's views on, II. 183; antagonism to, 250.
Eckington, home of Joseph Gales, II. 175.
Eddie, Edward C., Recorder of Deeds, II. 521 n.
Edmunds, George F., on street improvements, II. 503–504; damage to property of, paid for, 618; cited, 631.
Education, early conditions relative to, I. 88–91; provision for, in District of Columbia, 301–302, 335–336, 382 n.; efforts to establish system of public, 474–485; congress appealed to, for aid in, II. 372–373.
Effingham, residence of John A. Smith, II. 239.
Election of 1800, tensity of feeling over, I. 372–374.
Elgar, Joseph, appointed surveyor of the city, II. 2 n.; second commissioner of public buildings, 35.
Eliot, Samuel, I. 220 n.; treasurer of Washington Bridge Co., 507 n.
Eliot, Samuel, Jr., first vice-president of Botanical Society, II. 27 n.
Ellet, Charles, Jr., report by, on suspension bridge, II. 356 n.
Ellicott, Andrew, first topographic map of District by, I. 63 n., 144–145; appointed to survey bounds of federal district, 125–126; sketch of career of, 126–127; progress in work of, and laying of first cornerstone of District boundary, 142–143; estimate of, as to Eastern Branch as a harbor, 151; quoted on L'Enfant, 167; quoted on farm lands on south side of Potomac, 173; L'Enfant's plan completed for engraving by, 173–176; Washington's opinion of, 184; drawing of city plan as completed by (1792), 184–186; suggestions of, looking to bettering L'Enfant's plan of city, 192–193; difficulties between commissioners and, 209; appointment as surveyor of road in Pennsylvania, 209–210; ability and skill of, 210; causes of friction between commissioners and, 210–211.
Ellicott, Benjamin, I. 127, 152–153, 156, 166, 209, 240; introduces suggestion of Washington plan in laying out of Buffalo, 210 n.

Ellicott, Joseph, I. 127, 240.
Elliot, Jonathan, printer of *Washington City Gazette*, I. 594, II. 168; publication of directory proposed by, 27; Floræ Columbianæ issued by, 28 n.; publisher of *Washington City Weekly Gazette*, 168.
Elliot, Rev. Robert, elected principal of Eastern Academy, I. 481, 485 n.
Elliot, S. A., secretary of Franklin Temperance Society, II. 222 n.
Elliot, William, publisher of *Washington City Gazette*, I. 594.
Elliot, Mrs. William G., directress of Female Union Benevolent Society, II. 220 n.
Elliot, William P., appointed surveyor of the city, II. 2 n.; charter member of Botanical Society, 27 n., 31; government service of, 78; plans for treasury building presented by, 244; patent office designed by, 246.
Elvans, John R., trustee of Freedmen's Bureau, II. 556; limited suffrage advocated by, 570–571.
Emancipation of negroes in District, II. 513–516; effect of, discussed, 521–523.
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, preaches in First Unitarian Church, II. 184.
Emerson Institute, founding of, II. 378.
Emery; Matthew G., candidate for mayor in 1870, II. 567.
Emigrants, Asiatic cholera among, II. 239.
English, David, on board of directors of Georgetown Gas Company, II. 301 n.
English, Lydia S., private school of, II. 208; used as hospital, 479 n.; second directress of Georgetown Orphan Asylum, 219 n.
Epidemics in Washington, II. 309.
Epiphany Episcopal Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.
Episcopal Church, development of, in Potomac region, I. 81 ff.; first church building of, in District, 233; in the District after 1803, 603–604.
Equal rights, struggle over, II. 529–533.
Era. See *National Era.*
Erskine, David M., British minister in Washington, I. 574.
E Street Baptist Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.
Evans, J. O., trustee of Washington Club, II. 608 n.
Evening Express, II. 463 n.
Evening Leader, II. 463 n.
Evening Star, II. 420, 421.
Evermay, Davidson residence, I. 573.
Ewell, Dr. James, I. 628, II. 7.
Ewell, Dr. Thomas, residence of, II. 7; later occupants, 7 n.; Anacostia bridge owned by, 98–99; mentioned 492, 530.
Executions in District of Columbia, I. 551–552.
Executive departments, question of location of, relative to capitol, I. 306–307; accommodations for, II. 66–69.
Explorations, early scientific, II. 327.
Expositor, Alexandria semi-weekly, I. 586.

F

Fahnestock, Harris C., treasurer of Street Railway Co., II. 492.
Fairfax County, Va., creation of, I. 45.
Fairfax Parish, establishment of, I. 82.
Fairs in Maryland and Virginia in early times, I. 60–61; public, in Washington (1804–1806), 520–521.
Falls Church, Fairfax Parish, I. 82.
Fares on early stage lines, I. 363.
Farmers and Mechanics Bank, Georgetown, I. 617, II. 195, 493 n.
Farmers Bank of Alexandria, I. 535.
Farming lands in vicinity of District, report of commissioners concerning, I. 171–173.
Farnham, R., treasurer of New England Society, II. 382 n.
Farnham, Robert, and Co., publishers of *Constitution*, II. 418 n.
Faw, Abraham, I. 397 n.
Faw, Jonathan, I. 424 n.
"Feather-duster legislature," II. 638.
Featherstonhaugh, G. W., geological explorer, II. 327.
Federal employment, injustice of system of, II. 75.
Federal government, relation of, to District. *See* District government.
Federalist, II. 178.
Federalist, Washington. See *Washington Federalist.*
Federalist party, defeat of, in election of 1800, I. 373–374; bitterness of feeling in, toward Madison and War of 1812, 590 ff.
Federal Lodge of Masons, I. 617 n., II. 197 n.
Federal Lottery No. 2, Blodgett's, I. 227–230, 283–285, 288, 333–334.

Federal Republican, Baltimore newspaper attacked by Republicans (1812), I. 590–591; removal of publication office to Georgetown, and continued troubles over, 591–592; mentioned, II. 173, 178.

Federal Spring, Washington, I. 559–560.

Female Benevolent Society of Georgetown, I. 543; board of directors, 543 n.

Female charity schools, II. 373.

Female Free School and Orphan Asylum, II. 218.

Female Union Benevolent Society, cheese sold for benefit of, II. 220; directresses of, 220 n.

Fendall, Philip Richard, I. 189; elected president of Bank of Alexandria, 208 n.; editor of *Journal*, II. 225; district attorney, 273, 304, 387 n.

Fenton, Charles W., publisher of *National Whig*, II. 417 n.

Fenwick, Bennet, I. 313.

Fenwick, George, I. 209, 241.

Fenwick, Joseph, I. 330.

Fenwick, Mason & Co., firm of, I. 330.

Ferguson, Rev. W. M., cited, I. 602.

Ferry, the lower, at foot of South Capitol Street, I. 242; the Georgetown, 493; from Maryland Avenue to Alexander's Island, 501.

Fifth Baptist Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.

Fillmore, Millard, interest of, in *Intelligencer*, II. 417.

Financial panic (1837), II. 250.

Findlay, Jonathan S., school principal and librarian of Washington Library I. 522.

Finlay, Rev. Samuel, I. 89.

Finley, Rev. Robert, American Colonization Society organized by, II. 136.

Fire companies, organization of, in District of Columbia, I. 557–559, II. 243; disorder among, 277–279.

Fire company, the first Washington, I. 287.

Fire department, inadequacy of, II. 483; reorganization of, 484.

Fire engines, government-owned, II. 242, 243; provision made for, 274; first steam, 483.

Fire insurance companies, organization of, I. 433, 563–564, II. 277.

Fire protection, inadequate, II. 242.

Fires, in Washington in 1800, I. 384–385; rarity of, in early Washington, 556; provision for protection, against, 556–559; new buildings as a result of, II. 242–248.

First Baptist Church, I. 408, II. 189; changed to theatre, 494–495.

First Colored Baptist Church, II. 189.

First Congregational Society of Washington, II. 390.

First National Bank, 492–493; failure of, II. 622.

First Presbyterian Church, Washington, I. 601; President Adams attends, II. 183 n.; bell arrangement of, 185; date of laying of cornerstone, 197; female charity school on property of, 373; effect on, of lecture delivered in, by Frederick Douglass, 548.

First Regiment of District of Columbia Volunteers, formed, II. 477.

First Unitarian Church, designed by Bulfinch, II. 36; mentioned, 181; date of organization, 184; first bell in city erected on, 185.

Fisher, Ellwood, editor *Southern Press*, II. 418 n.

Fisher, George P., associate justice of supreme court, II. 518; appointed district attorney, 518 n.; connection of, with code of 1872, 631 n.

Fisk, Theophilus, newspaper owner, II. 408 n., 409 n.

Fitzhugh, Nicholas, appointed associate judge of circuit court of District, I. 455; death of, II 82.

Fitzhugh, William M., on board of directors of Georgetown Gas Company, II. 301 n.

Fleete, Henry, early explorer of locality of District of Columbia, I. 47.

Fletcher Chapel Methodist Episcopal, date of erection, II. 285 n.

Floræ Columbianæ, II. 28 n.

Florence, Thomas B., editor of *Daily Constitutional Union*, II. 463.

Florula Columbiensis, II. 28 n.

Floyd, William, I. 5.

Footways, appropriation for making, in Washington, I. 340; contracts made for laying, along Pennsylvania Avenue, 358; need of improvement in, and assessment for, II. 16–17.

Force, Peter, mayor of Washington, I. 367 n., II. 167; editor of *National Journal*, 170; on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.; editor of American Archives, 252; mentioned, 254, 427 n., 464; candidate for mayor, 292, 404 n.

Ford's Theatre, established, II. 494–495; assassination of President Lincoln in, 537.

Foreign representatives, proposed donation of sites for residences for, I. 277, 328; in Washington during Jefferson's administration, 574; absence of, from Washington at time of British invasion, 630; change in social intercourse of, with president, II. 50.

Forney, John W., connection of, with *Union*, II. 425; owner of *Chronicle*, 463.

Forrest, Uriah, I. 77, 100–101, 109, 135 n., 329; dinner to Washington at residence of, 133; a protestant against unexpected area of federal city, 138, 144; one of incorporators of Georgetown Bridge Co., 171; charged with being at bottom of trouble over dismissal of L'Enfant, 179; an incorporator of Bank of Columbia, 223; mayor of Georgetown, 275 n.; an incorporator of Georgetown Mutual Insurance Co., 337; member of committee to receive President Adams, 348; President Adams entertained by, 349; appointed clerk of circuit court for Washington County, 413; sketch of career, 413; death of, and poor financial condition of estate, 455, 555.

Forsyth, John, speech of, in regard to lack of authority over rotunda, II. 43, 44.

Fort Mifflin, fortifications at, erected under charge of L'Enfant, I. 182–183.

Fortress Monroe, fleeing slaves seek refuge at, II. 522.

Fort Sumter, fired on, II. 471.

Fort Washington, L'Enfant's work at, I. 183; fortification of, in 1808, 569–570; called Fort Warburton, 570 n.; repair of, upon British advance on Washington, 613; blown up and abandoned, 630; restoration of, 635.

Foster, Sir Augustus, English spectator of Jefferson's second inaugural, I. 458; manuscript by, 574 n.; cited, 578, 579, 603.

Foundry Church, II. 187–188.

Fountain Inn, I. 159, II. 59–60; city post-office in, 247 n.

Four Mile Run, bridge over, I. 532, 533.

Fourteenth Street, opening of, by Washington city government, I. 516.

Fourth Presbyterian Church, organized, II. 182, 183; female charity school on property of, 373.

Fox, Cephas, I. 408 n.

Fox, Edward, killed in duel, II. 55 n.

Fox, John, one of Union Land association promoters, II. 370 n.

Foxall, Henry, manufacturer of ordnance, I. 332–333; an incorporator of Georgetown Lancaster School Society, 484 n.; mayor of Georgetown, II. 160 n.

Foxall, Henry, Methodist benefactor, II. 187.

Foy, John, first gardener employed on capitol grounds, II. 215.

Franchise, qualifications for exercise of, in Georgetown and Alexandria, I. 446; political, discussion of, II. 162–164; restrictions of, opposed, 255–256; discussion of, under commission government, 637–642.

Franchise bill, II. 553.

Franchise restrictions on citizens of Washington, I. 471–472.

Franklin, Nicholas, assistance of, in opening school for colored children, II. 137.

Franklin Fire Co., II. 279.

Franklin fire-engine house, II. 242, 243 n.

Franklin Fire Insurance Company of Washington, I. 564.

Franklin House, I. 292, 380, 520; dinner for Lafayette given at, II. 45; mentioned, 60, 61, 169, 194.

Franklin Park, springs in, I. 560, II. 65; unimproved condition of, 317.

Franklin Press, the, I. 435 n.

Franklin School, II. 507.

Franklin Temperance Society of Washington, II. 222.

Franzoni, Carlo, sculptor employed in capitol, II. 32.

Franzoni, Giuseppe, Italian sculptor employed on capitol, I. 454; clock in the house designed by, II. 32.

Frederick County, Md., creation of, 45; division of, during Revolutionary war, I. 77–78.

Frederick-Rockville Pike, President Jackson vetoes bill for, II. 102, 131.

Fredericksburg, refugee settlement, II. 523.

Free colored people, refusal of, to accept colonization scheme, II. 136; practice of selling, as slaves, 139.

Freedmen's Aid Association, organization of, II. 521.

Freedmen's Bureau, Barry farm purchased by, II. 556; hospital erected by, 557.

Freedmen's Hospital, II. 539.

Freedmen's Saving and Trust Company, II. 557.

Freeman, Rev. Adam, Baptist minister, I. 408.

Freeman, Thomas, surveyor, I. 241; quoted in connection with uses of reservations, 254.

Freemen's Total Abstinence Society, II. 395.

Free negroes, ordinances designed to control, in Washington, I. 547–549; percentage of, to white population in Washington and Maryland, 548 n.

Free-school laws in Virginia and Maryland, I. 88–89.

Free-soil party, II. 428.

Frémont, J. C., first Republican presidential candidate, II. 392.

French, B. B., president of telegraph company, II. 367; chief marshal of Lincoln inaugural parade, II. 468; chairman of ball committee at Lincoln inauguration, 535 n.

French, George, an incorporator of Columbian Library, I. 522 n.

French, Dr. Robert, II. 12 n.

French and Indian war, echoes of, in Potomac country, I. 64–66.

Freshets, damage resulting from, II. 314–315.

Friend of the People, Richmond newspaper, I. 367.

Fugitive slave law, repeal of, II. 519.

Fugitt, Nathaniel B., secretary of Washington Club, II. 608 n.

Fuller, Azariah, proprietor of Mansion House, II. 59 n.; proprietor of Fountain Inn, 247 n.

Fuller's Hotel, II. 242, 445 n.

Fulton, Charles C., editor of *National Whig*, II. 232 n.

Fulton, Robert, experiments of, with steamboat and submarine torpedo, I. 580, 581; visits of, to Washington, 581, 582.

Funded debt limit, congress provides for, II. 612.

Funding of national debt, connection between bill in reference to, and final location of permanent seat of government, I. 41–43.

Funerals of congressmen, I. 607–608.

Funk, Jacob, original proprietor I. 59; land donated by, for German Lutheran Church, II. 190.

Furniture for White House, controversy over, with President Monroe, II. 35.

G

Gadsby, John, hotel proprietor, II. 61, 445 n.

Gadsby's, dinner at, in honor of first steam train, II. 117; General Harrison guest at, 270; enlarged, 445 n.

Gales, Joseph A., newspaper publisher, I. 365.

Gales, Joseph, Jr., president of Washington Humane Society, I. 542 n.; buys the *National Intelligencer*, 587 n.; mayor of Washington, II. 165, 175, 177, 404 n., 427 n.; member of Columbian Horticultural Society, 193.

Gales and Seaton, firm of, I. 587 n., 588; proprietors of *National Intelligencer*, II. 165; as public printers, 174, 175; congressional debates reported and published by, 176, 177, 226, 413.

Gallatin, Albert, Washington home of, as secretary of treasury, I. 406; cited, 432 n., 536.

Gallaudet, Dr. Edward M., head of Columbia Deaf and Dumb Institution, II. 218.

Gallaudet, Peter W., manual-labor school organized by, II. 218.

Gamble, William, II. 214 n.

Gambling, increase and restraint of, II. 95; police protection of, 432.

Gant, Thomas, Jr., I. 74.

Gantt, Dr. Edward, I. 324 n.

Gantt, John M., I. 137; chosen secretary of board of commissioners of federal district, 145; clerk for recording land deeds, 170, 414; one of managers of lottery scheme, 205; admitted as attorney by circuit court of District, 414 n.

Garbage removal, tax for, II. 303.

Gardenier, Barent, duel fought by, II. 55 n.

Gardening, early interest in, I. 597.

Gardiner, George A., trial of, by jury, II. 441.

Garfield Park, II. 317; used as public nursery, 328; improvement of, 330.

Garrett, John W., president of Baltimore and Ohio Co., II. 545.

Garrison, William Lloyd, proposal of, to establish *Liberator*, II. 141–142.

Gas, introduction of, II. 16; development of use of, 296–302.

Gas Co., attempts to regulate, II. 295–302.

Gas inspector, office of, created, II. 301.

Genius of Universal Emancipation, published by Benjamin Lundy, II. 142, 143.

Gentleman's Pocket Remembrancer for the Year 1813, I. 617 n.

Georgetown, as a commercial centre, I. 92, 93, 96–102; leading men of, 100–102; character of residential portion of city, 102; Masonic lodge in, 102–103; notable social occasions in, 103–104; advantages of vicinity of, as a federal seat, set forth in written address to Washington, 109; attention given to site of, by Jefferson and Washington, 118–119; Washington's proclamation of inclusion of, in federal district, 119–120; visit of Washington to, to discuss matters with landowners, 131–133; proposition to include, within limits of federal city, 139; the base of supplies for builders of new city, and headquarters of commissioners, 164–165; as a market for tobacco, 172; newspapers in, 224, 436, 586–587, 589–590; early prediction of incorporation of, with Washington, 273; observations of foreign travellers on, 273–274; progress in growth of, 275; list of mayors, 275 n., 596 n.; Columbian Library of, 301; physicians at, 324 n.; opening of theatre in, 334; visit of President Adams to, 348; population in 1800, 355, 356; stage lines to (1800), 363–364; objection by people of, to proposed bridge over Potomac (1801), 428–430; voting qualifications in, 446; salary of mayor of, 468 n.; system of taxation in, 470; first public school in, 476; matter of a Sunday market in, 489; Sunday restrictions in, 489–490; objections in, to building of Washington canal, 495–498; paving of roadways in, 509 n.; control of tobacco trade by, 524–525; banks of, 535; provision for care of the poor in, 540 n., 543; power of levy court over taxation of, 547; night watch in, 549 n.; provision for fire protection in, 557; publication of the *Federal Republican* in, 590–591; Methodist Church in, 603; Episcopal Church in, 603–604; proposal to remove seat of government to, after British destruction of public buildings in Washington, 634; population of, in 1820, II. 2 n.; health officer in, 12 n.; street lighting in, 15 n.; separate court for, suggested, 89; canal enterprise and, 126, 131; Chain Bridge bought by, 129–130; benefits derived by, from "congress fund," 130; colored people of, protest against colonization scheme, 136; retrocession movement in, 153–154, 260–261; decay of, as seaport, 156; beginning of amalgamation movement, 158–159, 267–268; banks in, 195; public school system of, 203, 375–376; female orphan asylum in, 219; provision for poorhouse in, 220; cholera hospital established in, 240 n.; cartmen's parade in, 254; unrest in, due to economic conditions, 267; proposed merger of, with Washington, 458, 553.

Georgetown Academy, II. 208.

Georgetown Advocate, II. 282.

Georgetown appropriation, II. 129–131.

Georgetown-Bladensburg Road, I. 61–62.

Georgetown Bridge Co., incorporation of, I. 171; construction of bridge by, 243; notice issued by, calling for payment of installments, 290; description of bridge built by, 290–291; condition and prospects of, in 1801, 430–431.

Georgetown College, I. 85, 90–91, II. 208; cadets of, 453.

Georgetown Commercial Co., I. 529.

Georgetown Gas Co., II. 300.

Georgetown Journal, II. 227.

Georgetown Lancaster School Society, incorporation of, I. 484.

Georgetown Mutual Insurance Co., formation of, I. 337.

Georgetown Pike, II. 101.

Georgetown Savings Institution, II. 195.

Georgetown Weekly Ledger, early newspaper, I. 94, 224.

German in America, II. 283.

German Benevolent Society, II. 283.

German church in Georgetown, I. 409.

German Lutheran Church, II. 190.

German population, growth of, II. 283.

Germans, anticipated settlement of, in vicinity of Georgetown, I. 87 n.

Germantown, Pa., proposed as seat of permanent government, I. 33–34.

Gerry, Elbridge, I. 17.

Gevelot, Nicholas, sculptor, pupils of, employed in capitol, II. 32.

Gibson, duel fought by, II. 55 n.

Giddings, Joshua R., antislavery leader in house, II. 387.

Gideon, George S., on board of police commissioners, II. 487 n.

Gideon, Jacob, II. 214 n.

Gideon, Jacob, Jr., II. 214 n.; Florula Columbiensis compiled by, II. 28 n.

Gideon, Mrs. Jacob, female charity school of, II. 373.

Gill, John, I. 337.

Gillespie, Congressman James, burial place of, I. 608.

Gillies, Dr. James, I. 324 n

Gillis, J. M., member of Scientific Club, II. 328 n.

Gilpin, George, appointed judge of orphans' court of Alexandria, I. 412; appointed harbor master in Alexandria County, I. 424.

Gird, Henry, Jr., newspaper editor, I. 303 n.

Given, John T., Democratic candidate for mayor (1867), II. 563.

Glass manufacturing in Washington, I. 531.

Glenwood Cemetery Co., II. 314.

Globe, II. 225, 226, 227, 229, 279, 280, 282, 407, 408, 412, 417, 443 n.

Glover, Charles C., public park acquired through initiative of, II. 582.

Goddard, John H., chosen first captain of police force, II. 274, 403 n., 462.

Gonzaga College, II. 208 n.

Gooding, D. S., marshal of District, II. 585.

Goodloe, D. R., publisher of *Christian Statesman*, II. 422 n.; marshal at Lincoln inaugural parade, 535 n.

Gordon, George, early landholder, I. 58.

Gough, John B., II. 396 n.

Gouverneur, Samuel L., President Monroe's son-in-law and secretary, II. 50.

Government, National, responsibility of, as landowner, II. 19; increase in executive business of, 66–67; public property protected by, 463; removal of, from Washington suggested, 565. *See* City government *and* District government.

Government buildings, errors in choice of sites for, II. 246.

Government clerks. *See* Clerks.

Government printing-office, established, II. 443.

Government property, freedom of, from taxation in Washington, I. 471; measures taken by congress to sell, II. 17–18; discussion of taxation of, 26, 123–124; Shepherd's valuation of, 624–625.

Governor, office of, abolished, II. 631.

Governor's staff, object of satire, II. 607.

Grace Episcopal Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.

Graham, William A., defeated Whig candidate, II. 422.

Grammer, G. C., president of Patriotic Bank, II. 258.

Grand Inauguration Ball (1848), II. 416.

Grand Lodge of Masons of District, city hall corner-stone laid by, II. 80; other corner-stones laid by, 80 n.

Grant, General U. S., nominated for presidency, II. 561; election of, 572; inaugural ceremonies of, 572–573, 619; social régime under, 583–585; recommends appropriations for District, 613–614; commissioners appointed by, 631.

Grassi, Father, Superior of Jesuits, quoted, I. 602–603.

Graveyards about churches, I. 607.

Great Falls, canal built by Potomac Co. at, I. 274–275.

Great Falls Manufacturing Co., delays city water-supply, II. 306–307.

Great Hotel, Blodgett's, I. 205, 228, 528, 555 n., 631 n.

Greeley, Horace, editor *New York Tribune*, II. 281–282; advice to government clerks, 591.

Green, Charles D., an incorporator of Columbian Library, I. 522 n.

Green, Duff, takes charge of *United States Telegraph*, II. 173; printer chosen by senate, 174; member of Jackson central committee, 210; elected printer of congress, 226; publishes *Reformer*, 229.

Green, Jonas, printer and publisher, I. 95.

Greenleaf, James, first appearance of, in Washington affairs, I. 214–215; real estate transactions of, 215–222, 234–237, 243 ff., 256–259; erection of buildings by, 233; brewery business started by, 291; newspaper war between Nicholson and, 297; imprisonment and bankruptcy of, 298; duel between Captain Duncanson and, 321; reduced circumstances of, 556.

Greenleaf Point, earthwork fortifications at, I. 616.

Greenough, Horatio, commissioned by congress to make Washington statue, II. 245, 328.

Greer, William, newspaper publisher, II. 234 n.

Greuhm, Baron Frederick, minister from Prussia, death of, occasions questions involving form and procedure, II. 52; marriage of, 52–53.

Grimes, James W., on street-improvement bill, II. 501.

Grinnell, Rev. J. B., pastor First Congregational Church, II. 390.

Gross, A. and M., publishers of *Washington Wochenblatt*, II. 426 n.

Grover's Theatre. *See* National Theatre.

Grund, Francis J., II. 415 n.

Guide books to Washington, first, I. 617, II. 27, 170.

Gunnell, Dr. James S., residence of, II. 192; city postmaster, 192, 247 n.; post-office location proposed by, 284–285.

Gunton, Dr. William, president of Columbia Turnpike Co., II. 345.

Gurley, Rev. P. D., pastor of F Street Presbyterian Church, II. 391 n.

Gurley, Rev. R. R., editor of *Christian Statesman*, II. 234 n., 422 n.

Gustine, Dr. Joel T., II. 12 n.

H

Habersham, postmaster-general, on the location of the Washington post-office, I. 345.

Hack drivers, opposition of, to laying of sidewalks, II. 18; city ordinances regarding, 561.

Hadfield, George, architect appointed to take charge of work on capitol building, I. 242; commissioners' difficulties with, due to determination to change plans, 259–260; discharge of, 314; charges against, 315; buildings in Washington designed by, 317; architect of Washington County jail, 544 n.; Commodore Porter's house designed by, II. 5; design of, for city hall, accepted, 79; building designed by, 172; branch bank designed by, 195.

Hagerstown, Md., I. 108; reception given Washington by citizens of, 112, 119.

Hale, John P., antislavery leader in senate, II. 387.

Hall, Mrs. Anne Maria, school for colored children opened by, II. 137 n.

Hall, David A., president of New England Society, II. 382 n.

Hall, Richard M., Recorder of Deeds, II. 521 n.

Hallet, Stephen, plan submitted by for capitol building, I. 195 n., 196; employed to render Thornton's plan of capitol practicable and to erect the building, 203; discharge of, 241.

Halsey, Rev. Luther, declines call to Second Presbyterian Church, II. 183.

Hamburg, town site of, I. 59; price per acre of land acquired in, for federal district, 125.

Hamilton, Alexander, quoted, I. 2; mentioned, 5; the possible originator of idea of jurisdiction of congress over the permanent seat, 15–16; agreement arranged by, concerning funding bill and residence bill, 41–43; asks L'Enfant to prepare devices for new coinage, 180; interest of, in manufacturing metropolis projected at falls of the Passaic, 182.

Hamilton, John J., editor of *American Mechanic*, II. 231.

Hamilton, Paul, secretary of the navy, I. 580, 627 n.

Hamlin, Hannibal, head of Freedmen's Aid Association, II. 521; territorial bill introduced in senate by, 576; later opinion of territorial bill, 579.

Hamlink, D. F., member of Grant's police board, II. 581 n.

Hancock, Md., proposition to locate seat of government at, I. 38.

Hand, J. W., charter member of Botanical Society, II. 27 n., 31.

Hanging, as penalty for crime, II. 83–84.

Hanson, Alexander C., editor of *Federal Republican*, I. 590; elected to congress and to United States senate, 591.

Hanson, Samuel, publisher of *Columbian Chronicle* and cashier of Bank of Columbia, I. 284.

Hanson, T. M., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.

Harbaugh, Leonard, builder of bridge across Rock Creek, I. 189, 190, 243; contracts for public buildings taken by, 314; builds later bridge across Rock Creek (1800), 360.

Hard Cider campaign, aftermath of, II. 269–272.

Hargrove, Rev. Mr., minister of New Jerusalem Church at capital, I. 606.

Harlan, James, editorial of, in *Chronicle*, II. 632.

Harper, William, suit of, to enforce issue of commission as justice of the peace, I. 410; director of Washington Bridge Co., 506 n.

Harrington, George, II. 365 n.

Harrington, Richard, assistant district attorney, safe blown open in office of, II. 624.

Harris, William A., editor of *Constitution*, II. 281.

Harrison, Dr. Elisha, II. 12 n.

Harrison, Dr. John, II. 12 n.

Harrison, Richard, bill of, for expense of removal to Washington, I. 352–353.

Harrison, William Henry, *Mirror* supports, II. 229; inauguration ceremonies of, 269, 270, 271; death of, 271.

Hartshorne, William, I. 337.

Hats, custom of wearing during sessions of house, II. 45.

Havre de Grace, burning of, by British, I. 612.

Hawley, Rev. William, rector of St. John's Episcopal Church, funeral discourse by, cited, I. 570, II. 181, 184.

Hay, Mrs. George, represents Mrs. Monroe in society, II. 49.

Hayes, President, inaugural ceremonies for, II. 640–641.

Health conditions, improving public, II. 11–13, 309–317.

Health department, creation of, II. 12.

Health officer, creation of office, II. 12.

Heart, J., editor of *Spectator*, II. 280.

Heath, Nathaniel K., rope manufacturer, I. 527.

Heiss, John P., associate editor of *Washington Union*, II. 408; proprietor of *States*, 442.

Heister, Daniel, funeral of, I. 607.

Henderson, Colonel Archibald, on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, II. 245 n.

Henderson, Dr. Thomas, II. 12 n.; connection of, with Columbian Medical School, 201 n.

Hendricks, Thomas A., II. 553.

Henfry, Benjamin, experiment of, with illuminating gas, II. 15 n.

Henley, General David, superannuated government clerk, II. 76.

Henry, Professor Joseph, weather forecasts made by, II. 327; member of Scientific Club, 328 n.; president of Columbian Association of Teachers, 377.

Henshaw, J. L., secretary of Temperance Hall Association, II. 397 n.

Hepburn, David, gardener, I. 598.

Herbert, John, nominated judge of orphans' court, Alexandria County, I. 403; appointment not carried out by Jefferson, 412.

Herold, Booth fellow-conspirator, hanged, II. 539.

Heronimus, Pendleton, hotel keeper, II. 14 n.

Herrman, Augustine, map of, I. 48.

Herty, Thomas, secretary of Washington Building Co., I. 433.

Hewitt, John, appointed register of wills for Washington County, I. 412, II. 77 n.; admitted as attorney, I. 414 n.; director of Washington Library Co., 521 n.

Hewitt, William, first digest of laws of city corporation prepared by, II. 11; Grand Master of Masons, 80.

Hickman, Robert S., notorious gambler, II. 433 n.

Hickory Club, II. 236.

High Joint Commission, II. 587.

Highways, across Alleghany range, I. 46 n.; in region of District of Columbia in early days, 61–63; from Washington to outside points, 515–516, 532–535, II. 100–103, 344–348.

Hilgard, J. E., member of Scientific Club, II. 328 n.

Hill, Isaac, II. 415 n.

Hill, Silas H., president of Gas Co., II. 298; leader of Know Nothing party, 428.

Hillyer, Curtis J., property interests of, II. 620, 621.

Hive, Washington weekly paper, I. 589, 590.

Hoban, James, wins premium for best plan of president's house, I. 194–195; sketch of career, 194 n.; character of design of, 195; in charge of work on the Great Hotel, 260; captain of first Washington militia company, 293; market house removed from President's Square by, 420; structure for temporary accommodation of house of representatives erected by, 420; Latrobe's proposed improvement on plan of, for president's house, 460; on board of commissioners for sale

of public lots, II. 23 n.; directs rebuilding of White House, 46; plans of, for departmental buildings, 68; directs building of White House portico, 238 n.
Hoban, James (son of above), unsuccessful candidate for mayoralty, II. 254; District attorney, 387 n.
Hodgson, Joseph, owner of house leased to government and destroyed by fire, I. 351, 385.
Holmead, Anthony, I. 109, 135 n.
Holmead, William, suburban movement attempted by, II. 368–369.
Holmeads, the, early landholders, I. 53–54.
Holmes Island, offered for sale, II. 250 n.
Holt, Theodore, horticulturist, I. 597 n.
Homans, Benjamin, Georgetown paper bought by, II. 227, 228.
Home department, discussion of proposed, II. 66, 69.
Homestead, as a suburb, II. 370.
Hommedieu, Ezra L., cited, I. 11.
Hood, Zachariah, stamp distributer, I. 71.
Hooe, Robert T., auditor of accounts of commissioners, I. 224; incorporator of Marine Insurance Co. of Alexandria, 337; suit brought by, to secure commission as justice of the peace, 410.
Hooper, Samuel, Andrew Johnson guest of, II. 538 n.
Hoover, Jonah D., II. 365 n.; marshal of the District, 386 n.
Hopkins, Edward, killed in duel, II. 55 n.
Hopkinson, Francis, criticism of two-capital plan by, I. 18.
Hornet, launching of the, I. 526.
Horse boat, II. 102.
Horse racing in District, I. 304, II. 368–369; races of Washington Jockey Club, I. 609–611.
Horse sheds between White House and treasury, II. 64–65.
Horsley, Dr. Samuel, II. 12 n.
Horticulturists, pamphlets and advertisements of early, I. 597; society formed by, II. 193.
Horton, Gilbert, free colored man, escapes slavery, II. 138.
Hospital, erection of a, on Judiciary Square, I. 232; purchase of, for a poorhouse, 421, 451; need of, II. 239–241; contagious, 309.
Hospital service during civil war, II. 479–480.
Hospital Square, city almshouse on, II. 331.
Hotel building, principal prize in Blodgett's lottery scheme, I. 205, 206; progress made in work of construction, 260; bought by government for post-office department, 528, 555 n., 631 n.
Hotel lottery, Blodgett's, I. 205, 229–231.
Hotels, the first, within limits of federal city, I. 261; later structures in Washington and Georgetown, 279–280, 292–293, 312–313, 343–344; at time of removal of congress to Washington, 380; in 1804–1810, 516–520; precarious existence of early, 518; in 1815, 635–636; changes in, II. 59–63, 445.
Hotel Spring, Washington, I. 559.
House chamber, custody of, intrusted to marshal of the District, II. 57.
House of representatives, description of first meeting place in Washington (1800), I. 378; temporary structure for accommodation of (the "Oven"), 420, 453; oath of office administered to President Madison in, 461, 612; Sunday religious meetings in hall of, 606–607; custody of chamber intrusted to marshal of District, II. 57.
Houston, James A., senate reports printed by, II. 411, 415 n.
Howard, General O. O., head of Freedmen's Bureau, II. 556.
Howard Reservoir, II. 239 n.
Howard Society, organization of, II. 217–218.
Howard University, II. 557, 591.
Hoxie, Lieutenant Richard L., in charge of public improvement work, II. 632.
Hughes, Colonel G. W., investigation of, for water-supply, II. 305.
Hughes, William, secretary of Washington Horticultural Society, II. 194 n.
Humane Society, Washington, I. 542 n.
Humphrey, Richard L., letter of, quoted, I. 570 n.
Humphreys, A. A., directs street grading, II. 284 n.; member of Scientific Club, 328 n.
Humphreys, David C., associate justice of Supreme Court, II. 518 n.
Hunt, Rev. James, school opened at Bladensburg by, I. 90.
Hunt, William, congressional letter-writer, II. 235 n.

Hunter, Alexander, marshal of the District, II. 225, 386 n.

Hunter, Rev. Dr. Andrew, charter member of Columbian Institute, II. 29 n.

Hunter, Naisworthy, first congressman to die in Washington, I. 607.

Huntington, William S., on committee for Grant inaugural ceremonies, II. 572 n.

Huntress, edited by Anne Royall, II. 233.

Huntt, Dr. Henry, first health officer, II. 12, 12 n.; curator of Botanical Society, 27 n., 31; on commission to select penitentiary site, 88 n.

Hutchinson, William, early patentee of land in Potomac region, I. 50.

I

Impartial Observer and Washington Advertiser, first Washington newspaper, I. 263–264; existing copies of, 264 n.; end of, 282.

Imprisonment for debt, rigor of laws as to, in District of Columbia, I. 552–553, II. 89–91.

Inaugural ceremonies, changes in, proposed, II. 56–57.

Inauguration, Jefferson's first, I. 404–407; Jefferson's second, 457–458; Madison's first, 460–462; Madison's second, 612; Monroe's first, II. 33–34; Monroe's second, 57–59; J. Q. Adams', 171–172; Jackson's first, 213–216; Jackson's second, 236–238; Van Buren's, 251; Harrison's, 269, 270, 271; Polk's, 405; Taylor's, 416–417; Pierce's 404–405; Buchanan's, 442; Lincoln's first, 469–470; Lincoln's second, 536–537; Johnson's, 538; Grant's, 572–573.

Inauguration ball, the first, I. 461–462; second, in 1813, 612.

Incorporation of Washington, I. 445–446.

Independent, newspaper organ of Henry Clay, II. 281, 282.

Independent American, tri-weekly newspaper, I. 587 n.

Indian Queen Hotel, I. 517 n., 539, 563 n.; Monroe inaugural ball at, II. 58; proprietors, 59; enlarged, 61; dinner in Henry Clay's honor at, 62–63; mentioned, 445 n.

Indians, traces of, in the Potomac region, I. 46–48.

Indian trade, the, I. 572 n.

Ingersoll, E. C., trustee of Washington Club, II. 608 n.; connection of, with code of 1872, 631, 631 n.

Ingle, John P., member of city hall erection commission, II. 79 n.

Ingle, Mrs. Joseph, treasurer of Female Union Benevolent Society, II. 220 n.

Insane, inadequate provision for, II. 241; government hospital for, 336, 337, 371 n.

Inspection force, increase in, II. 2.

Insurance Co. of North America, starting of, I. 188.

Insurance companies formed in Georgetown and Alexandria, I. 337; organization of fire, in 1809 and later, 563–564, II. 277.

Intelligencer. See *National Intelligencer.*

Intemperance, relation of, to poverty recognized, II. 221, 223.

Irish as laborers in Washington, I. 500 n.

Ironsides, George E., private school of, II. 207.

Irving, Washington, visits of, to Washington, I. 571, 578–580; quoted on Washington life, 578, 579–580.

Irving Hotel, II. 445 n.

Island, the, as population centre, II. 284; dissatisfaction of citizens of, over street improvements, 286, 287.

Island Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.

Italian sculptors, work in capitol done by, II. 32.

Italy, marble carved in, for capitol, II. 32.

J

Jackson, Andrew, II. 20, 165, 183; Mr. Adams gives ball in honor of, 51; lives at Franklin House, 60; appoints first board of prison inspectors, 87 n.; District considered favored by, 131; admirers of, organize, 173; attends Columbian College commencement, 200; régime under, 210–213; inaugural ceremonies, 213–216, 236–238; sells Numidian lion for poor relief, 219; large cheese presented to, 220; insane man shoots at, 241; portrait of, in city hall, 249; wins respect and gratitude of citizens, 249; family of, 250; nurses coachman through smallpox, 309; bronze statue of, 329.

Jackson, Francis J., British minister in Washington, I. 574, 575.
Jackson, Joshua, fire in house of, I. 384.
Jackson central committee, II. 210; policy of, 211.
Jackson City, plan for, fails, II. 249–250.
Jackson Democratic Association, II. 271 n., 455.
Jackson Hall, National Inauguration Ball at, II. 416.
Jackson Place, opening of, II. 7–8, 330.
Jackson Riflemen, formation of, II. 213.
Jails, early Washington, I. 286, 422, 544; unwholesome condition of, II. 92; new structures, 93.
Jail warden, congress creates office of, II. 520.
James, William, director of Washington Library Co., I. 521 n.
James Creek, bridges across, I. 493.
Japan, first embassy from, II. 453.
Jefferson, Joseph, early home of, II. 197 n.
Jefferson, Thomas, effort of, to have congress meet at Alexandria, Va., I. 18 n.; cited concerning disappearance of Indians from Potomac region, 46–47; shares Washington's views as to improvement of Potomac, 68; free-school law framed for Virginia by, 88; writes out his views of method of carrying out residence law, 117–118; outline plan for federal city made by, 129–131; letter from, to Washington, commenting on price of land for federal district, 135; present at auction sale of city lots, 159; interest of, in Samuel Harrison Smith, 365–366; printing of manual of, 366; election of, to presidency in 1800, 374; custom of sending message to congress by secretary established by, 379; quarters of, on arrival as vice-president in Washington, 379–380; inauguration of, as president, 404–405; social duties fulfilled by, in president's house, 405; commissions executed by Adams withheld by, 409–410; first District appointments by, 410; personal interest of, in management of city affairs, 418; entertained at dinner in Alexandria, 423; letter to Latrobe appointing him surveyor of public buildings, 450, 451; plan of, for improvement of Pennsylvania Avenue, 456–457; description of second inaugural of, 457–458; at inauguration of Madison, 462; president of board of Washington school trustees, 479, 480; organization of District militia by, 565; criticism of, for not wearing a uniform while reviewing militia, 566; principle of equality observed by, in social affairs, 575–576; troubles between Merry, British minister, and, 577; customs as to dress, 577; library of, purchased by congress, 636; trees planted by direction of, II. 13; bronze statue of, 329.
Jefferson School, II. 508 n.
Jeffries, N. L., trustee of Washington Club, II. 608 n.
Jenifer, Daniel, duel fought by, II. 55 n.
Jessup, General Thomas S. on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, II. 245 n.
Jesuit novitiate, building used as, II. 207.
Jesuits in Maryland, I. 84.
Jews, application of, for Sunday trade, II. 402.
Jim Crow car, adoption of, II. 529, 530, 531.
Jockey Club, Washington, I. 609–611.
John Brown raid, effect of, II. 451.
John Marshall Place, city hall at head of, II. 81.
Johns, Thomas, I. 75.
Johnson, A. B., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.
Johnson, Andrew, sworn in as president, II. 538; reviews home-returning army, 539; reconstruction policy of, 546, 553; impeachment of, mentioned, 572; last day in office, 573; social régime in administration of, 581, 582.
Johnson, E. W., duel fought by, II. 55 n.
Johnson, Dr. James T., II. 12 n.
Johnson, Joshua, brother of Thomas Johnson and father-in-law of John Quincy Adams, I. 347; President Adams at house of, 349.
Johnson, Lewis, partner in City Savings Bank, II. 258 n.
Johnson, Reuben, president of Franklin Temperance Society, II. 222 n.
Johnson, Thomas, prominent Maryland citizen, a director of Potomac Co., I. 68; activities of, during Revolutionary period, 77; on

Georgetown as a market for tobacco, 97; appointed commissioner of federal district, 120–121; notice of distinguished career of, 121; report of, on farm lands in and about District, 171–172; retires from position as commissioner, 211, 237; controversy between commissioners and, over waterfront matter, 256; nominated chief judge of circuit court of District by President Adams, 402; declines to serve, 412.

Johnson, Thomas, Jr., clerk or secretary of board of District commissioners, I. 170; first postmaster of Washington, 170 n., 261; death of, 262.

Johnston, George, I. 71.

Johnston, Dr. William P., on city hospital staff, II. 340 n.

Jones, John B., *Madisonian* owned by, II. 280 n., 408 n.

Jones, Walter, I. 397 n., 424 n., district attorney, 584, 585, II. 8; major-general of District militia, 145.

Jones, William, secretary of navy, I. 614, 629, 636 n.

Jones, Dr. William, II. 12 n.; postmaster, 166 n., 224, 247 n., 284, 285; member of Jackson central committee, 210 n.

Jones Point, laying of corner-stone of District boundary at, I. 142–143; erection of fortifications on, 332.

Journal. See *National Journal.*

Journeymen Painters' Association, II. 231.

Judge of criminal court, salary of, II. 95.

Judge of orphans' court, Washington County, II. 77 n.

Judges of courts of District of Columbia, created by law of 1801, I. 401; nominations of, by President Adams, 402–403; holding back of commissions by Jefferson, 409–410.

Judiciary Square, site of, chosen, II. 18; site selected on, for city hall, 80.

Judson, Adoniram, Baptist missionary, II. 199.

Jurisdiction of congress over the permanent seat, origin of idea, I. 7–8, 15–16; objections raised to proposition of, 21; Madison's justification of, 22; confirmation of congressional power of, 41; exercise of, 397–401.

Jury, powers of, usurped by circuit court judges, II. 440.

Jusserand, J. J., address by, cited, I. 24.

Justices of peace, office of, established for District by law of 1801, I. 401; nominations for, by President Adams, 402; number of, reduced by Jefferson, 410; extension of jurisdiction of, in debt and damage cases, II. 89.

Juvenile delinquents, congress provides for, 87.

K

Kalorama, estate of Joel Barlow, I. 240, 582; leased by French minister, 583; Colonel George Bomford becomes owner of, II. 8.

Kearney, Colonel James, charter member of Botanical Society, II. 27 n., 31; on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.; chart of Potomac River made under direction of, 310.

Keiley, Rev. Jeremiah, principal of Catholic schools, II. 208.

Keith, Rev. Ruel, rector of Christ Episcopal Church, II. 186.

Kelly, Moses, II. 519 n.

Kendall, Amos, II. 415 n.; gives ground for Columbia Institution, 337; president of telegraph company, 367; suburban movement attempted by, 370.

Kendall Green, II. 370.

Kendallville, II. 370.

Kent, Joseph, services of, to city, II. 9.

Ketcham, John H., President Grant appoints commissioner, II. 632; resignation of, 632 n.

Key, Francis Scott, house of, I. 102, 413; an incorporator of Georgetown Lancaster School Society, 484. n.; district attorney, II. 8 n., 96, 273 n.; petitions congress for separate court in Georgetown, 89; services of, in slave case, 134–135.

Key, Philip Barton, I. 102 n., 413–414; head of congressional standing committee on District of Columbia, 545; succeeded as congressman by Alexander C. Hanson, 591; district attorney, II. 387; shooting of, 441.

Key of Keys (Quay of all Quays), I. 66, 219.

Kilbourn, Hallet, II. 365 n.; secretary of Washington Club, 608 n.; residence of, 620; connection of, with real estate pool, 624 n.

Kilty, William, appointed chief judge of circuit court of District, **I.** 412; charge of, to grand jury, quoted, 422–423; additional compensation asked by, 424; appointed chancellor of Maryland, 455.

King, C. B., member of art commission, **II.** 43 n.

King, Nicholas, surveyor, **I.** 300, 418 n.; founder of first Washington library, 300–301; chosen school trustee, 479.

King, Robert, surveyor, **I.** 300; plan of Washington by, 318 n.; returns to England, 418.

King, Robert, Jr., **I.** 300; in charge of survey of city lots and certifying of levels, 362; accompanies father to England, 418; cited, 438; surveyor, **II.** 2; draughtsman in land-office, 78.

King, William R., hotel keeper, **I.** 519 n.

Kingman, Elias, congressional letter-writer, **II.** 235 n., 365 n., 415 n.

Kingston, N. Y., application of, for permanent seat of government, **I.** 4–5.

Kirkwood House, **II.** 445 n.; Andrew Johnson sworn in as president at the, 538.

Klopper, F. A., chief of police, **II.** 403 n.

Knapp, Charles, residence of, **II.** 620 n.

Know Nothing party, **II.** 400, 404; newspaper organ of, 424; seizes Washington Monument Society, 427; legislation by, regarding elections, 428; national ticket of, 428; election riot of, 429.

Knox, Rev. Samuel, **I.** 90.

Kohlman, Rev. Anthony, discourses on Unitarianism by, **II.** 184–185; Washington Catholic Seminary conducted by, 208.

Krudener, Baron, Swann house occupied by, **II.** 8 n.

Kurtz, John, president of Georgetown Savings Institution, **II.** 195 n.

L

Laborers in Washington, settlement of troubles with, by commissioners, **I.** 322; hours and wages of, 322 n.

Labor organizations in Washington, **I.** 598–599, **II.** 230–232, 588.

Lafayette, General, dinner for, at Franklin House, **II.** 45; officially received in rotunda, 45; W. W. Seaton gives reception in honor of, 51; attends Columbian College commencement, 200.

Lafayette Park, **II.** 317.

Lafayette Square, beginning of residence section on, **II.** 6; opening of, 8; Jackson statue in, 329.

Laird, John, **I.** 101–102, 484 n.

Lambert, William, meridian observations made by, **II.** 77–78.

Lamon, Ward H., marshal of the District, **II.** 520.

Lancaster, Joseph, system of school instruction of, **II.** 203.

Lancaster, Pa., invitation to locate seat of government at, after burning of public buildings in Washington, **I.** 633–634.

Lancaster school, in Georgetown, **I.** 476, 484; opened in Washington, 484, **II.** 203.

Land values (1828), **II.** 193 n.

Lane, James H., east room guard gathered by, **II.** 474.

Lane, Jonathan H., member of Scientific Club, **II.** 328 n.

Lane, Colonel Samuel, first commissioner of public buildings, **II.** 35; incompatibility of, with Latrobe, 36.

Langdon, William C., instrumental in organizing Y. M. C. A., **II.** 434; secretary, 434 n.

Langworth, John, early landholder, **I.** 50.

Lanston, John M., accompanies Frederick Douglass to Washington, **II.** 547.

Laselle, Lucian, publisher of *Metropolitan*, **II.** 422 n.

Laselle, Mrs. N. P., literary editor of *Metropolitan*, **II.** 422 n.

Latrobe, B. H., reports by, quoted, **I.** 376–377, 495; description by, of capitol building in 1800, 377–378; appointed surveyor of Washington, 418 n.; appointed surveyor of public buildings, 450–451; previous activities of, as architect and engineer, 451; runs afoul of Thornton by criticising plan of capitol, 451–452; ability and merits of, 452; length of public service, 452; reports by, on progress of work on public buildings, 457 n.; improvements in plans of president's house and of capitol building proposed by, 460; engineer of Washington canal, 499; plan of navy yard by, 526; interest of, in introducing steamboats on the Potomac, 538; estimate of Samuel Blodgett by, 554 n.; directs work of erection of monument to naval heroes, 569; appointed surveyor of the city and superintendent of buildings, II. 2; designs residence for John P. Van Ness, 6, for Commodore Stephen Decatur, 7, for Robert Brent, 9; plan of, to change course of Tiber, 19; on committee of Columbian Institute, 29 n.; architect of capitol, 34; resignation of, as architect of capitol, 36; changes in capitol plans made by, 36; north and south porticos of White House proposed by, 64 n.; St. John's Church designed by, 181.

Latta, J. M., on committee for city government plan, II. 572 n.

Laurie, Rev. James, president of Washington Library Co., I. 521 n.; Presbyterian pastor in Washington, 599–600; vice-president of Bible Society of District of Columbia, 601 n.; first president of Botanical Society, II. 27 n., 31.

Laurie, Mrs. James, directress of Female Union Benevolent Society, II. 220 n.

Law, John, on aspect of Washington city in 1796, I. 285 n.; quoted, II. 5; charter member of Columbian Institute, 29 n., 31.

Law, Thomas, investments of, in Washington real estate, I. 244–247; residence of, at Greenleaf Point, 278; backer of sugar factory in Washington, 292, 304; building operations of, 311, 343; long course of litigation by, 321; an incorporator of Anacostia Bridge Co., 336; prologue to play, written by, 361; " Observations on the Intended Canal in Washington City," quoted, 449 n.; financial condition of, about 1809, 556; mentioned, II. 5, 30, 31; charter member of Columbian Institute, 29 n.

Lawlessness, rise of, II. 276–277.

Law reform, discussion of, II. 83, 94–95; discussion revived, 435; accomplished, 630–631.

Lawrence, A. H., first president of Y. M. C. A., II. 434.

Lawrence, Captain James, I. 617.

Lawrence, Richard, attack on President Jackson by, II. 241.

Law revision proposed, II. 9–11.

Laws, Cranch code of, II. 10; of District, printed, 11; of 1819 providing for street lighting, 15; futility of early, encouraging street improvement, 19; regarding sale of reservations, 21; Court of District hampered by obsolete, 82–83; relief measures, 84, 89; code prepared in 1830, 94–95; severity of old criminal, mitigated, 95; proposed code of, rejected, 439; codification of, in 1874, 630–631; code of 1872, 631 n.; of government in 1878, 641, 642.

Laws of corporation, digests of, issued, II. 11.

Lear, J. B., services of, in slave case, II. 134–135.

Lear, Tobias, Washington's private secretary, I. 115, 116; quoted on hopes of Philadelphia to remain permanent seat of government, 140–141; quoted in connection with engraving of L'Enfant's plan, 155–156; quoted in connection with price of lots in federal city, 161 n.; resignation of, as Washington's secretary, 201; embarks in mercantile life in Washington, 220–221; first book relating to District written by, 221–222; failure of, 415; appointed commercial agent at St. Domingo, 415 n.

Learned, J. D., proprietor of *Sun*, II. 228.

Lebanon Lodge of Masons, II. 197 n.

Lee, Charles, attorney-general, bill for expense of removal to Washington, I. 352; counsel for Adams appointees not commissioned by Jefferson, 410; admitted as attorney in Alexandria, 424 n.

Lee, Edmund I., I. 424 n.

Lee, General Henry (" Light Horse Harry "), I. 231; severely injured by Republican mob in 1812, 591.

Lee, Richard Bland, I. 28, 33, 43; quoted, 40; member of commission in charge of rebuilding of public edifices, 636; public service of, II. 34; judge of orphans' court, Washington County, 77 n.; quoted on District government, 156.

Legislation, course of, relating to: public grounds, II. 331; completion of city hall, 333–334; Centre Market improvement, 334–336; needs of dependent classes, 337–342; bridges, 342–343; roads, 344; railroads, 345–356; street railways, 363–366; schools, 374–377, 527; liquor

licenses, 398–401; police control, 458.
Legislature of District abolished, II. 631.
Leland, Rev. John, cheese presented President Jefferson by, I. 576 n.; discourse of, at Sunday religious meeting in house of representatives, 606.
L'Enfant, Pierre Charles, engaged by New York City to design and construct meeting hall of congress, I. 23; description of career and characteristics of, 23–26; appointed by Washington to prepare plan of federal city, 125–126; instructions issued to, 127–128; early suggestion as to treatment of land for city plan, 135–136; plans of European cities secured for, 141 n.; studies of, for plan of city covering larger area intended by Washington, 142; the "large plan" or "original plan" of, submitted to Washington, 147–150, 176–178; elaborate scheme of city planned by, 151–152; to carry out purpose, proposes exclusion of private landownership for a time, 152; difficulties with, in connection with engraving of plan, 155–157; refusal of, to allow plan to be exhibited at sale of city lots, 157; Washington's high estimate of, 157, 167; walls of Daniel Carroll's house pulled down by orders of, 166; quarries bought by, 169; events leading directly to dismissal of, 173–175; criticism by, of engraved map made from his incomplete plan, 177; beginning of opposition to board of commissioners with dismissal of, 178–179; letter of regret from property holders to, 179; question of compensation for services, 180; declines Hamilton's invitation to design new coins, 180; story of the Robert Morris house, 181; plans drawn by, for manufacturing metropolis on the Passaic, 182; subsequent professional engagements of, and last years, 182–183; provision for bridges, post road, and canal in plan of, 491; posterity's praise of, 508 n.
Lenox, Peter, I. 311.
Lenox, Walter, mayor, II. 365 n., 399, 404, 426.
Lenthal, John, clerk of works under Latrobe, I. 452, 453 n.
Lerchett, Legran I., publisher of *Citizens' Compiler*, II. 283 n.
Letter boxes, first installed, II. 491.
Letter-writers, reports of congressional sessions by, II. 234–235.
Levees, held by President Adams, I. 382; abolished by Jefferson, 575–576; revived by Madison, 578.
Levy court of Prince George County, local government for early Washington found in, I. 285.
Levy court of Washington County, I. 421; deprived of power to tax inhabitants of city of Washington, 471, 546.
Levy courts, provisions made for judges of, for Washington and Alexandria counties, I. 402–403; functions of, II. 551, 569.
Lewis, H. C., Washington journalist, I. 589.
Lewis, Joseph, chairman of District committee, II. 9.
"L—— Family in Washington," novel by George Watterston, II. 221.
Liancourt, Duke de la Rochefoucault, in Washington, I. 270, 272, 273, 274; description of Georgetown bridge by, 290–291.
Liberator, William Lloyd Garrison establishes, in Boston, II. 142.
Liberty Party, II. 381.
Libraries, in Alexandria and Georgetown, I. 301; circulating, 436; early Washington, 300–301, 521–522.
Library, of congress, I. 426; purchase of Jefferson's, to replace congressional, burned by British, 636; opening of, as general meeting place, II. 42.
Library Co., Alexandria, I. 301.
License system, II. 222.
Lighting of Washington streets, I. 419, 509, II. 14–16, 295, 300, 302.
Lincoln, Abraham, bill prepared by, while congressman, favoring emancipation, II. 388; sentiment for, in Washingtion, 454; secret arrival of, in Washington, 468–469; inaugural parade for, 469, 536; social ceremonies of, 470, 535; reëlection of, 535; ceremonies of second inauguration, 536–537; death of, 537; city mourns, 538; prohibition legislation requested of, 580.
Lincoln and Johnson Club, participates in inaugural preparations, II. 535.
Lind, Jenny, II. 406 n.
Lindo's Tavern, I. 533 n.
Lindsay, Adam, on board of com-

missioners for sale of public lots, II. 23 n.; connection of, with Navy Yard Bridge Co., 99 n.

Lindsay, George W., hotel keeper, I. 517 n.

Lindsly, Dr. Harvey, on city hospital staff, II. 339.

Lingan, James M., early landholder, I. 54, 109, 135 n., 329; collector of port of Georgetown, 96; a protestant against unexpected area of federal city, 138, 144; one of incorporators of Georgetown Bridge Co. 171; an incorporator of Bank of Columbia, 223; an incorporator of Georgetown Mutual Insurance Co., 337; member of committee to receive President Adams, 348; nominated for marshal of District by President Adams, 402; fails to receive commission from Jefferson, 411; killed by Republican mob in 1812, 591; national furore over murder of, 591; public funeral honors in memory of, 592–593; burial place of, 593 n.

Linthicum, Otho M., on Georgetown retrocession committee, II. 260 n.

Liquor, sale of, prohibited on Sunday, in Washington, I. 490; restricted, II. 222; prohibited on capitol grounds, 224; partially limited, 482; legislation relating to, 484–485.

Liquor license, first, issued in city of Washington, I. 191; restriction of, II. 580–581.

Literary Visitor, Georgetown periodical, I. 589.

Little, John, bill of, for expense of removal to Washington, I. 352.

Little, Robert, editor of *Washington Quarterly Magazine*, II. 179 n.

Little, Rev. Robert, pastor of Unitarian Church, II. 181, 183–184; sermon of, on current conditions, 249.

Little Falls, bridges across Potomac below the, I. 491–492; woolen mill set up at the, II. 4.

Little Falls Bridge, II. 256–257.

Little Hotel, the, I. 261, 280, 313.

"Little Schoolhouse Church, The," II. 188.

Liverpool, Moses, assistance of, in opening school for colored children, II. 137.

Livingston, Robert R., I. 581.

Livingstone, Edward, Decatur residence occupied by, II. 7 n.

Lloyd, William, II. 286 n.

Loan, first attempt to negotiate a, on city property in federal district, I. 187; negotiation of, from Maryland, by Washington authorities with aid of congress, 265–272; second, obtained from Maryland, 299; from Maryland in 1799, 329; sale of city lots to repay Maryland loan, 510.

Loan bill, under Shepherd rule, II. 602–605.

Local and national politics, II. 161–167, 405–407, 561.

Lodges, Masonic, building erected by, II. 197–198.

Logan, John A., suggests removal of government, II. 565.

Log cabin, Whigs erect on public grounds, II. 255.

Log-cabin and hard-cider campaign, II. 253.

Log Cabin Tavern, Whig meeting in, on bank measure veto, II. 272.

Long, Robert, hotel keeper, I. 519 n.

Long Bridge, II. 99, 129, 130; use of, for railroad purposes, 132, 349, 351, 355, 357; proposed town at end of, 249; repair of, delayed, 256–257; renewal of Georgetown contest over, 260–261.

Lotteries, organized to help progress of federal city, I. 205–208, 288, 289–290, 333–334, 480, 493; ordinances passed by city council for, in 1812 and following years, 550.

Lottery, held for erecting church building in Georgetown, I. 88; repudiation of Blodgett's, by city authorities, 228; suggestion of a, for starting a university in Washington, 480; for building a canal, 493; congress authorizes, for public needs (1815), II. 38, 79; collapse of, 81; (1814), 85, 87; Chain Bridge Co. asks for privilege of, 99; privilege of, asked for by Georgetown, 100; for school fund 203, 204, 207.

Loudoun County, Va., creation of, I. 45; marble from, used in capitol, II. 36.

Louisiana Avenue Theatre, II. 197 n., 269 n.

Loundes, Francis, member of Columbian Horticultural Society, II. 193.

Love, John, I. 397 n., 424 n.

Lovell, William, hotel keeper, I. 344, 380, 517.

Lovering, William, architect and builder, I. 278–279, 311.

Low grounds, improvement of, II. 21–25.

Lowndes, Francis, Jr., an incorporator of Columbian Library, I. 522 n.

Lowrie, Walter, president of Temperance Union, II. 223 n.

Ludloe, Augustus C., I. 617.

Lufborough, Nathan, views of, on intemperance, II. 222.

Lunatics, provision for, in Washington, I. 544.

Lundy, Benjamin, *Genius of Universal Emancipation* published by, II. 142, 380.

Lutheran Church in Georgetown, I. 86.

Lyon, James, newspaper proprietor, I. 367, 435–436.

Lyon, Matthew, I. 367.

M

MacArthur, Arthur, associate justice of supreme court, II. 518 n.

McCarty, John M., in duel with his cousin, A. T. Mason, II. 54.

Maclay, William, cited, I. 34, 42.

McClean, Archibald, I. 397 n.

McClellan, General George B., given command of army, II. 479, 481; directs law and order in city, 482.

McClelland, John, on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, II. 245 n.

McComb, J. N., member of Scientific Club, II. 328 n.

McCormick, Rev. A. T., school opened by, I. 301–302; discourse by, at first observance of Washington's birthday, 339; services in war office building conducted by, 382, 409.

McDowell, Major Irwin, militia mustered in by, II. 471.

McGrath, Thomas, horticulturist, I. 597 n.

McGuire, J. C., art gallery of, II. 450.

McGurk, James, execution of, I. 551.

Mackall, B. F., appointed assistant postmaster, II. 192.

McKendree Methodist Episcopal Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.

McKenna, James, auctioneer at sale of Washington city lots, I. 159.

McKenney, Samuel, on Georgetown retrocession committee, II. 260 n.

McKenney, Thomas L., editor of *Washington Republican*, II. 169.

McKeowin's Tavern, I. 517 n., 635; first meeting of Columbian Institute held at, II. 29 n.

Mackie, Dr. J. S., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434.

McLain, Rev. W., pastor of First Presbyterian Church, II. 185.

McLaughlin, proprietor of Union Tavern, Georgetown, I. 520.

McLeod, James, hotel keeper, I. 517.

McLeod, John, hotel keeper, II. 14 n.

McLeod, John, private school of, II. 204–207; Washington Relief Society organized by, 220.

McMahon, Dr. J. P. C., II. 12 n.

McMunn and Conrad's boarding-house, I. 379–380, 404, 407.

McVean, Rev. James, of Georgetown Academy, II. 209.

McWilliams, Dr. Alexander, II. 12 n.; curator of Botanical Society, 27 n.; list of plants of District compiled by, 28; on committee of Columbian Institute, 29 n., 30.

Madison, James, I. 8, 10, 14, 28, 34; on deficiencies of Princeton as a meeting-place of congress, 13; on question of the jurisdiction of congress over the permanent seat, 15; quoted, 16, 29; justification of the jurisdiction idea by, 22; argument of, on the subject of centrality, 30–31; present at auction sale of lots in federal city, 159; proposition of, concerning founding of a national university, 252; house in Washington occupied by, as secretary of state, 406; inauguration of, as president, 460–462; turns first sod in work on Washington canal, 499–500; opening of bridge across Potomac at Maryland Avenue by, 506; social functions during presidency of, 578; second inaugural of, 612; visit of committee of citizens to, at time of British invasion, 623; activities of, upon arrival of British force, 624, 629; travels of, during occupation of Washington by British, 629; residence presented to, II. 34.

Madison, Mrs., I. 462; directress of Washington City Orphan Asylum, 543 n.; social life in Washington at time of, 578; quoted in connection with British attack during War of 1812, 612–613; superintends removal of cabinet papers, 625; escapes from Washington, 629; establishes home in Washington, II. 251–252.

Madisonian, II. 232, 269; as government organ of Whigs, 279–280, 282; name of, changed, 408.

Madison Place, opening of, II. 8, 330.

" Madison's war," I. 590.

Magruder, A. C., I. 414 n.

Magruder, James A., on board of public works in Grant administration, II. 595.

Magruder, Samuel Wade, lieutenant in Maryland Provincials, I. 66.

Magruder, William B., postmaster at Georgetown, I. 96; an incorporator of Bank of Columbia, I. 223.

Magruder, Dr. William B., member of Washington Horticultural Society, II. 194 n.; mayor, quoted on public schools, 377; fusion candidate for mayor, 428, 456; presides at meeting for inaugural arrangements, 442.

Maher, James, gardener in government employ, II. 215 n., 327 n.

Mail, improvements in service, II. 491.

Main, Thomas, pamphlet by, on use of hedge plants, I. 597.

Maine Avenue, opening of, II. 22.

Makemie, Rev. Francis, I. 80.

Malaria, conditions favoring, II. 309–312.

Male Orphan Asylum, II. 218.

Mall, early uses of, I. 277; congress and the, II. 25, 323–327, 619.

Manassas Gap Railroad, II. 345.

Mann, Horace, work of, as abolitionist, II. 387.

Mansion Hotel, II. 59, 59 n., 61–62, 194.

Manufactures, attempts to establish, in Washington, I. 524–527, 529–531, II. 4; reasons for lack of success, I. 531.

Map, topographic, of District, by Andrew Ellicott, I. 63 n.; of Washington, 144–145; engraved map, from Ellicott's completion of L'Enfant's plan, 176; of the city drawn by F. C. De Kraft, II. 3 n. *See* Plan.

Marble, used in rebuilding capitol, II. 32, 36, 37.

Marbury, John, on Georgetown retrocession committee, II. 260 n.

Marbury, William, appointed naval agent, I. 331; suit of, to enforce issue of commission as justice of the peace, 410; connection of, with Navy Yard Bridge Co., II. 99 n.

Marbury *vs.* Madison, decision of Supreme Court in, I. 410.

Marine Band, I. 371; concerts by, 406, II. 276, 447; music by, at services in capitol, I. 606–607; addition of Italian musicians, 607; first participation of, in inaugural ceremonies, II. 58; participation of, in Washington City Canal celebration, 104; in war time, 494.

Marine Corps, headquarters of, established in Washington, I. 370–371; plan and location of barracks for, 372; objections to appearance of members of, at polling places, 372–373.

Market house in Georgetown, lottery organized to pay for ground for, I. 289–290.

Market house, Washington, first location of, on President's Square, I. 419; removal of, to Market Square, 420; on New Jersey Avenue, 486; the Centre Market, 486; Eastern Branch Market, 486; the Western Market, 486–487; Capitol Hill Market, 487.

Markets, agitation against Sunday, I. 488–489.

Marriages, Maryland tax on, I. 476.

Marshal of the District, I. 402, 411, 422, 572 n., II. 215, 236, 421, 431, 442 n., 456, 488; Tench Ringgold appointed, II. 34–35; retirement of Washington Boyd as, 35; office of, in capitol, 37; office of, in Brick Capitol, 40; custody of house chamber intrusted to, 57; functions of, 57; president's aide on social occasions, 57, 585; congress purchases rooms in city hall for use of, 81; Adams inaugural ceremonies in charge of, 171; at Jackson's inauguration, 213, 236; Jackson appointees, 224–225; frequent changes of, 386 n.; office of, investigated, 520; as aide to President Grant, 585.

Marshall, James, nominated associate judge of circuit court of District by President Adams, I. 402, II. 82; career of, I. 412; resignation of, 455.

Marshall, John, first president of Washington National Monument Society, II. 245.

Martin, J. L., editor of *Spectator*, II. 280; appointments to Paris legation, 281.

Maryland, laws enacted by, relating to District, I, 169–171; loans to federal city by, 271–272, 299, 329;

road-building by, 534; progress in emancipation of negroes in, 548 n.; connection of, with Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, II. 114.

Maryland Chronicle, early newspaper, I. 96.

Maryland Gazette, I. 95, 96.

Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, I. 95–96; announcement in, relative to city lots, and account of federal city, 161–162.

Mason, Colonel Armistead T., I. 629; chairman of District committee, II. 9 n.; killed in duel, 54.

Mason, John, I. 102, 337; merchant and president of Bank of Columbia, 223, 330; appointed brigadier-general of militia of District, 565; retires from militia, 572; Columbian Foundry bought by, II. 187.

Mason, John Thompson, appointed attorney for District of Columbia, I, 411; admitted as attorney by circuit court, 414 n.

Mason, Thomas F., first judge of criminal court, II. 96.

Mason, Thompson F., on first board of prison inspectors, II. 87 n.

Masonic Hall, Republican Citizens' Inaugural ball at, II. 236; city post-office in, 247; meeting called in, to organize Y. M. C. A., 434.

Masonic temple, erection of, II. 589.

Masons, lodge of, in Georgetown, I. 102–103; lodge of, in Alexandria, and General Washington's connection with, 103; laying of first corner-stone of District boundary by Alexandria lodge, 142–143; first lodge of, organized in Washington, 204 n.; observation of St. John's Day by, in building at the capitol, 261; observance of Washington's birthday by Federal Lodge No. 15, 339; lodges in District in 1813, 617 n.; Grand Lodge of, of District, city hall corner-stone laid by, II. 80; other corner-stones laid by, 80 n.; building erected by, 197–198; Social Lodge of, 379.

Master mechanics' association, II. 588.

Mathew, Father Theobald, temperance advocate, reception of, II. 398.

Matthews, Rev. William, priest of the parish of St. Patrick, II. 190; founder of St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, 207, 219.

Mattingly, Edward, II. 189 n.

Maury, John W., mayor, II. 404, 425, 426.

May, Dr. Frederick, I. 323, II. 12 n; director of Washington Bridge Co., I. 506 n.; connection of, with Columbian Medical School, II. 201 n.

May, Dr. George, II. 12 n.

May, Henry, judiciary assailed by, II. 436; court reform agitation of, 439; disbarred, 440; opposition of, to court bill, 518.

Mayors of Georgetown, lists of, I. 275 n., 596 n.; mentioned, II. 160 n., 268, 353 n., 365 n., 486, 558.

Mayor of Washington, appointed by the president, I. 445; salary provided for, 468; office of, made elective by city council, 595, by popular vote, II. 160; plan for colored schools issue of campaign for, 388–389; partisan appointments of, 431; arms procured by, 451; office held by (in the order of service): Robert Brent, I. 467, Daniel Rapine, 467, II. 161, Dr. James W. Blake, I. 468, II. 5, 33, 161, Benjamin G. Orr, 161, Samuel N. Smallwood, 161, 162, Thomas Carbery, 162, Roger C. Weightman, 162, Joseph Gales, 165, John P. Van Ness, 165, 236, 254, William A. Bradley, 167, 254, Peter Force, 167, 254, 292, William W. Seaton, 167, 254, 270, 292, 318, 332, 554, Walter Lenox, 399, 400, 402, 403, 404, 426, 432, 433, John W. Maury, 404, 425, 426, 427, John T. Towers, 319, 404, 427, Dr. William B. Magruder, 377, 428, 429, 442, 456, 458, James G. Berret, 393, 430, 456, 458, 467, 486–487, 554, Richard Wallach, 456, 457, 487, 504, 505, 516, 526, 527, 554, 560, 563, Sayles J. Bowen, 561–568, 588, Matthew G. Emery, 567, 569.

Mechanics, shortage of, in building operations at Washington, I. 231.

Mechanics Bank of Alexandria, I. 535.

Mechanics Relief Society, application of, to hold lottery for school purposes, II. 207.

Medical School, Columbian College, II. 200–201.

Medical Society, organization of, II. 12.

Medicine, practice of, first placed under regulation, II. 12.

Meehan, John S., publisher of *United States Telegraph*, II. 173; appointed librarian of congress, 225.

Meigs, Josiah, charter member of Columbian Institute, II. 29 n.; on Columbian College faculty, 200 n.

Meigs, M. C., investigation of, for

water-supply, II. 306; member of Scientific Club, 328 n.
Meigs, Return J., work of, on preparation of code for colored people, II. 521.
Melish, John, English traveller, on Washington in 1806, I. 508 n.
Menon, Count de, residence of, II. 192.
Mercer, George, stamp distributer, I. 71.
Merchant, newspaper enterprise of Duff Green, II. 229.
Merchants of Alexandria in 1770, I. 57 n.
Merchants Bank, II. 493 n.
Meredith, Samuel, expenses of, for removal to Washington, I. 352.
Meridian Hill, residence of Commodore Porter, II. 6; Adams leases Commodore Porter's house on, 216; real estate speculation on, 590.
Merrick, R. T., trustee of Washington Club, II. 608 n.
Merrick, William M., President Buchanan appoints associate District judge, II. 438; attempt by, to check power of provost guard, 488.
Merry, Anthony, British minister in Washington, I. 574–577.
Methodist Church, in Potomac region, I. 87; growth of, in the District, 601–602; Georgetown, II. 186.
Methodist Protestant Church, II. 187, 188.
Metropolitan, a Georgetown tri-weekly paper, II. 178, 228 n., 422 n.
Metropolitan Bank, II. 493 n.
Metropolitan Club, II. 608.
Metropolitan Hotel, I. 517 n.
Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, dedication of, II. 394.
Metropolitan police board, powers of, II. 460.
Metropolitan police force, created by congress, II. 274, 459, 460.
Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, II. 394 n.
Metropolitan Presbyterian Free Church, II. 394.
Metropolitan Railroad Co., II. 351, 493; controversy of, with board of public works, 615–616.
Meyers, Solomon, hotel keeper, I. 517.
Middleton, E. J., deputy in office of Recorder of Deeds, II. 521 n.
"Midnight Judges," Adams', I. 403, 412–413.
Milburn, Benedict, jailer of District, imprisonment of, II. 488.
Military academy, effort to remove, from West Point to Washington, II. 21 n.
Military and Naval Magazine of United States, II. 234 n.
Military companies, renewed interest in, II. 452.
Military museum, II, 331.
Military rule, city under, II. 484–488; directness of, 486–488.
Militia, organization of a, in District of Columbia (1802), I. 564–566; compulsory service in, 566–568; renewed interest in, during War of 1812, 611; enrolment of, upon approach of British, 613; unskilful handling of, against British invaders, 622–624; retreat of, before British force, 626; need of, in District emphasized, II. 452; organized in District, 464–465; mustered into regular army, 471–472.
Militia companies in Washington in 1800, I. 382–383.
Militia company, the first, in Washington, I. 293.
Militia law, changes in, recommended, II. 452.
Militia system, failure of, II. 146–149; revival of, 452, 464–468.
Miller, M. H., first treasurer of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.
Miller, Dr. Thomas, on city hospital staff, II. 339.
Milligen, Joseph, Georgetown bookseller and publisher, I. 589, II. 178 n.
Mills, Clark, statues designed by, II. 329.
Mills, John, chief of police, II. 403 n.
Mills, Robert, plans for treasury building presented by, II. 244; Washington Monument designed by, 245; construction of government buildings superintended by, 246; plans for post-office made by, 248; engineer in charge of completion of city canal, 265 n.
Mine mentioned in vicinity of the Great Falls, I. 172 n.
Miner, Charles, service of, in slave case, II. 139, 140.
Miner, Myrtilla, school for colored girls opened by, II. 389.
Miner Normal School, II. 389 n.
Mint, site selected for, in Washington, I. 254; effort to remove, from Philadelphia to Washington, II. 21 n.
Mirror of the Patent Office, II. 179 n.
Missouri Avenue, opening of, II. 22.
Mob violence due to slavery agitation, II. 143–144.

Monitor, Washington weekly, I. 588–589.

Monroe, James, secretary of state at time of War of 1812, I. 614, 631; inauguration as president, II. 33–34, 57–59; White House furniture controversy, 35; financial stress of, 36; White House occupied by, 46–50; leader in changes in social practice, 49, 50; declines invitation to ball in honor of General Jackson, 51; changes proposed at second inauguration of, 56–57; District affairs discussed by, in annual messages, 63–64; candidate for presidential nomination, 168; attends Columbian College commencement, 200.

Monroe, Miss, marriage of, II. 50 n., 54 n.; social events planned in honor of, 53.

Monroe, Mrs., etiquette of first calls changed by, II. 47.

Monroe, Joseph Jones, president's brother and secretary, II. 50.

Montgomery County, Md., creation of, I. 78; marble from, used in capitol, II. 36.

Moore, Cleon, register of wills in Alexandria County, I, 403, 424.

Moore, Henry, I. 414 n.

Moore, Rev. Jeremiah, Baptist minister, I. 408 n.

Moore, J. M., charter member of Botanical Society, II. 27 n., 31.

Moore, Thomas, causeway and dams built by, I. 496, 504, 505.

Moore, William Evelyn, congressional letter-writer, II. 235 n.

More, Benjamin, merchant and newspaper proprietor, I. 282, 283, 303 n.; secretary of Federal Lodge of Masons, 339.

Morfitt, Henry M., member of Jackson central committee, II. 210 n.; delegate to first Democratic convention, 236.

Morgan, E. D., on committee for Grant inaugural ceremonies, II. 572 n.

Morin, Lewis, house built for hotel purposes by, I. 344.

Morning News, II. 463 n.

Morrill, Justin M., II. 625.

Morrill, Lot M., proposed change of, in District government, II. 550–551.

Morrill bill for commission government, revived, II. 569.

Morris, George, newspaper editor, II. 409 n.

Morris, Robert, views of, on permanent seat of government, I. 31, 34; house of, in Philadelphia leased for occupancy of Washington, 115–116; transaction between L'Enfant and, relative to building of Washington residence, 181; land purchases undertaken by, in conjunction with Greenleaf, 216–220, 234; first visit made by, to new city, 279; hopefulness of, in regard to Washington real estate, 281; financial ruin and imprisonment of, 298; difficulties of commissioners over lots of, 319 ff.

Morris, Robert, Jr., partner with Foxall in manufacture of iron and ordnance, I. 332, 333 n.

Morris National Press and Journal Weekly, II. 409 n.

Morris Village, I. 465.

Morrison, G. F., principal of Rugby Academy, II. 378.

Morrison, William M., book-store of, II. 228.

Morse, Samuel F. B., II. 366.

Morsell, James S., I. 414 n; appointed judge, II. 82; calls attention of grand jury to slave conditions, 134; long service of, 438.

Morton, Oliver P., opposes provisions of District government bill, II. 638.

Mount Olive Methodist Church, II. 188.

Mt. Olivet Cemetery, II. 314.

Mount Vernon, establishment of steamboat line to, II. 371.

Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, II. 371.

Mount Vernon Square, fire enginehouse on, II. 284.

Mount Vernon Turnpike Co., II. 372.

Mount Zion Methodist Episcopal Church, II. 187.

Mudd, Ignatius, commissioner of public buildings, II. 297.

Muir, Rev. James, I. 143; president of Bible Society of District of Columbia, 601 n.

Mullett, A. B., on board of public works in Grant administration, II, 595.

Mulligan, Joseph, bookseller, circulating library of, I. 521.

Municipal expenses, sharing of, by general and local governments, II. 19.

Municipal government provided for Washington, I. 445–446.

Municipal ownership of gas and water suggested, II. 299.

Munro, Robert, an incorporator of Georgetown Lancaster School Society, I. 484 n.

Munroe, Thomas, postmaster of Washington, I. 345, II. 34; appointed superintendent of city, I. 346, 417; curious position of, as to payment of salaries, 417–418; report of, cited, 457; elected school trustee, 479; candidate for mayor, II. 165; removal of, as postmaster, 224; on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.

Murder Bay, settlement of, II. 523.

Murdock, Rev. George, I. 71.

Murdock, William, I. 71.

Murray, Stanislaus, partner in City Savings Bank, II. 258 n.

Murtagh, W. H., member of Grant's police board, II. 581 n.

Museum and Georgetown Advertiser, I. 587 n.

Museum and Washington and Georgetown Advertiser, I. 368, 436.

Music in school curriculum, II. 377.

Mussey, R. D., connection of, with code of 1872, II. 631 n.

Musters of District militia, I. 565, 566, 567–568, II. 471–472.

N

National and local politics, II. 161–167, 405–407.

National bank law, II. 258.

National Base-ball Club, II. 495 n.

National Blues, organized, II. 452 n.

National Calendar and Annals of the United States, publication of, II. 170.

National Church enterprise, II. 394.

National Equal Rights League, II. 558.

National Era, II. 380, 381, 384, 387, 390, 418.

National Greys of Philadelphia, II. 271.

National Guards, II. 452 n., 453 n.

National Hotel, erected, II. 61; Bank of Washington on first floor of, 196; President Jackson escorted to, 212; sickness in, due to obstructed sewers, 308.

National Hotel (second), II. 445 n.; office of telegraph censor in, during war, 474 n.

National Inauguration Ball (1848), II. 416.

National Institution, II. 30, 325–326.

National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser, establishment of, I. 90, 365, 366; removal of location of office, 434; prosperous career of, 435, 587–588; first reports in, of discussions in congress, 436–437; published by Gales and Seaton, 587–588; left without competition in Washington newspaper field, 588; daily edition of, during War of 1812, 594; office of, burned by British, 628; resumes publication, 632; mentioned, II. 168, 174, 175, 176–177, 227, 229, 279, 281, 282, 408, 412, 417, 419–420, 426, 443 n., 455 n., 463, 573 n.

National interests, influence of city on, II. 63–69.

National Journal, II. 169, 170, 171, 174, 225.

National Magazine, first periodical published in District, I. 367, 368.

National Messenger, II. 178.

National Monument, II. 422 n.

National Palladium, II. 179.

National Pike, the old, from Cumberland to Wheeling, I. 46 n.

National Register, purchased by *Washington Gazette*, II. 169.

National Republican, daily newspaper, II. 462, 463.

National Rifles, organized, II. 452 n.

National Theatre, II. 197, 405, 406; color discrimination in gallery of, 532.

National Typographic Society, organization of, II. 230.

National university, plan for a, advocated by Samuel Blodgett, I. 188–189; mention of, in document of commissioners, 222; Washington's plan to found, and gift of Potomac Co. shares toward, 251; question of site for, 251–252; proposition to sell public lots and use funds for, 511; funds for, solicited by Samuel Blodgett, 553–554; prospectus of a, prepared by Joel Barlow, 581.

National Volunteers, II. 455.

National Whig, newspaper organ for Henry Clay, II. 232; career of, closed, 417.

National Zeitung, II. 282, 283.

Native American, II. 234.

Native American movement, II. 234.

Nat Turner insurrection, II. 142.

Naval Hospital, II. 240.

Naval Lodge of Masons, I. 617 n.

Naval monument, erection of, I. 568–569.

Naval Observatory, II. 327, 331.

Navy department, establishment of, in Washington, I. 351.

Navy Department building, II. 68 n.

Navy yard, site for, I. 330–331; slow

development of, 331; importance of, as an industrial centre, 525–526; erection of monument in, to Tripoli heroes, 568–569.

Navy Yard Baptist Church, **I.** 604–605, **II.** 189.

Navy Yard Bridge Co., **II.** 99.

Navy Yard Fire Co., **II.** 279 n.

Navy Yard Hill, **I.** 525.

Navy Yard Methodist Church, **II.** 188.

Neale, Henry C., register of wills, **II.** 77 n.; secretary of Jackson central committee, 210 n.

Negro Suffrage and District Government, **II.** 546–568; discussion of, discontinued, **II.** 638.

Neuville, Baron de, Decatur residence occupied by, **II.** 7 n.

Neuville, Madame de, social events of, **II.** 50.

Newcomb, Simon, member of Scientific Club, **II.** 328 n.

New Cut Road, opening of, **II.** 130.

New England Society, **II.** 382–383.

New Jersey, offers made by, in regard to securing seat of national capital, **I.** 6–7.

New Jersey Avenue, opening of, **I.** 523, 524.

New Jerusalem Church, Washington, **I.** 606.

New Jerusalem Lodge, **II.** 197 n.

New Jerusalem Swedenborgian Church, date of erection, **II.** 285 n.

New National Era, **II.** 599.

New National Theatre, **II.** 495.

Newspaper men, provision for, in congress, **II.** 177, 235.

Newspapers, the first, in Virginia and Maryland, **I.** 93–96; of Georgetown, 224, 436, 586–587, 589–590; first newspaper published in Washington (1795), 263–264; in 1796–1797, 283–285; in 1797–1798, 302–303; of Alexandria, 303, 369, 436, 586; established in Washington upon location there of government, 364–370; letters published in, relative to District government problem, 388–396; in 1801, 434–436; first reports in, of discussions in congress, 436–437; from 1807 to 1811, 585–590; rapidity of appearance and disappearance of, 589; during War of 1812, 590–596; in 1814, 617; as political organs, **II.** 168–179, 210–211, 224–233, 279–283, 407–408, 416–422, 442–443, 455 n., 462–463; public printing and, 407–415, 423–427; connection between, broken, 442–443.

New Year's Day observances in Washington, in Jefferson's time, **I.** 576; President Monroe's change in procedure at, **II.** 49.

New York Associated Press, **II.** 414.

New York City, meeting of continental congress in, **I.** 12, 22; plans made by, looking to securing permanent seat of federal government, 22–23, 26; feeling in, concerning removal of federal seat, 106–107; gas for street lighting adopted in, **II.** 16; all-rail journey possible from Washington to, 132.

New York Enquirer, **II.** 178 n.

New York Express, **II.** 414.

New York Tribune, **II.** 282.

Niblack, William E., on city government problem, **II.** 575.

Nichols, C. H., on committee for city government plan, **II.** 572 n.

Nicholls, James B., **I.** 337.

Nicholson, A. O. P., connection of, with *Union* newspaper, **II.** 425.

Nicholson, John, association with Morris and Greenleaf in land speculation in Washington, **I.** 217, 220, 234, 257, 279, 295; newspaper war between Greenleaf and, 297; financial ruin, and death of, in debtors' prison, 298.

Night schools, **II.** 377.

Night watch, provision for, lacking in early Washington, **I.** 548; established in Alexandria, 548 n.; established in Washington during fear of British attack, 615.

Niles' Register, **II.** 234.

Noah, M. M., **II.** 415 n.

Noland, William, commissioner of public buildings, **II.** 246.

No-license campaign in Washington, **II.** 223.

Norfolk, Va., foundation and incorporation of, **I.** 57.

Norman building for Smithsonian Institution, **II.** 323.

Norris, J. E., secretary of Democratic Association, **II.** 271 n.

North American, II. 228–229.

Northern Liberties, development of, as population centre, **II.** 283–284.

Northern Liberties' Market, destruction of, **II.** 614.

Northern Liberties' Market riot, **II.** 428–429.

Nourse, Joseph, bill of, for expense of removal to Washington, **I.** 353;

an incorporator of Columbian Library, 522 n.; places owned by, 573; veteran government clerk, **II**. 76 n.

Novels of Washington society, **II**. 221.

Noyes, Crosby S., on committee for street improvement, **II**. 501.

Numidian lion, sold for poor relief, **II**. 219.

Nurserymen, association of, **II**. 193–194.

O

Oak Hill Cemetery, **II**. 313.

Oakley, John, collector of port of Georgetown, **I**. 411.

Octagon House, plans for, made by Thornton, **I**. 316, 346; occupied by French minister, 627.

Odd Fellows, Union Friendship lodge of, **II**. 379; first parade of colored, in inaugural procession, 535–536.

Oden, Benjamin, original proprietor of land in federal district, **I**. 135 n.

Offices, small number of changes in, under Jefferson, **I**. 439.

Officials, proposal to remove property qualification from, **II**. 256.

Ohio Co., the, **I**. 64.

Old School Baptists, **II**. 189.

Olin, Abraham B., associate justice of Supreme Court, **II**. 518.

Olio, Georgetown weekly, **I**. 587 n.

Olmstead, Fred Law, landscape architect of Capitol Park, **II**. 619.

Omnibus lines, **II**. 238; merger of, 361–363.

O'Neale, William, hotel keeper, **I**. 292, 351 n., 380, 520; proprietor of Franklin House, **II**. 60; on first board of prison inspectors, 87 n.

Orange and Alexandria Railroad, **II**. 345.

Ordinances passed by municipal governments, printing of, **I**. 474.

Orme, Archibald, **I**. 66.

Orphan asylums, Washington, **I**. 543, **II**. 218, 219.

Orphans' court of District of Columbia, created by law of 1801, **I**. 401; first meeting of, 414; office of, removed to City Hall, **II**. 81 n.; new court system and, 519.

Orr, Benjamin G., mayor of Washington, **II**. 161.

Otis, James F., congressional letter-writer, **II**. 235 n.

Ould, Henry, school opened in Washington under direction of, **I**. 484; public school teacher, **II**. 204 n.

Ould, Robert, Lancastrian school opened in Georgetown by, **I**. 484; District attorney, **II**. 387 n.; work of, on code of laws, 439.

Oven, temporary building for house of representatives called the, **I**. 420, 453.

Overton, William, editor of *Sentinel*, **II**. 424 n.

P

Panic periods, **II**. 533–535, 621.

Paper manufacturing in Washington, **I**. 530–531.

Park, public, proposed, **II**. 582.

Parker, Peter, member of Scientific Club, **II**. 328 n.

Parkinson, Rev. William, Baptist minister, **I**. 408 n., 409.

Parks, William, printer and publisher, **I**. 95.

Parrott, Richard, rope walk of, **I**. 527; Georgetown Wool and Cotton Manufactory started by, 530.

Parrott's Woods, **I**. 593, 596, 622 n.; Oak Hill Cemetery in, **II**. 313.

Partisan politics, **II**. 253–258, 430–431.

Party press, birth of, **II**. 168–179. *See* Newspapers.

Patent office, error in choice of site for, **II**. 246; quarters of, in Blodgett Hotel, 247; in city hall, 247.

Paterson, N. J., early plans for manufacturing metropolis on site of, **I**. 182.

Patrick, J., publisher of *Saturday Evening Mail*, **II**. 426 n.

Patriotic Bank, the, **I**. 537, **II**. 195, 196; savings institution opened in, 258.

Patterson, Mrs. Daniel T., President Johnson's daughter, **II**. 581.

Patterson, Edgar, paper manufacturer, **I**. 530.

Patuxent River, British invasion up the, **I**. 618, 619.

Paul Pry, edited by Anne Royall, **II**. 232.

Paxton Boys, incident of the, **I**. 116.

Payne, Lewis, associate of Booth in Lincoln conspiracy, **II**. 537; hanging of, 539.

Peabody, J. J., first chief engineer of fire department, **II**. 483 n.

Peacock, Robert W., boarding-house of, **I**. 380; admitted as attorney, 414 n.; real estate business conducted by, 434 n.

Peale, Titian H., member of Scientific Club, **II**. 328 n.

Pearson, Joseph, services of, to city, II. 9.

Peirce, Edward, original proprietor of land in federal district, I. 135 n.

Peirce, Isaac, horticulturist, I. 598 n.

Peircy, James, I. 292, 304 n., 434.

Pendleton, W. S., engraver of *American Botanical Register*, II. 28 n.

Penitentiary, movement for erection of, II. 83; effort to secure, 85; federal and local interest in, 86; congress decides to establish national, 87; convict labor system in, 87; site for, selected, 87–88; erection of, 88; congress provides for erection of, 93.

Pennsylvania, offers made by, to secure permanent seat of government, I. 34.

Pennsylvania Avenue, the birthday of, I. 192; opening of, 276; condition of, in 1800, 357–358; improvement of, as carried on by Jefferson, 456–457; amount spent on, 457; first inaugural procession to pass up, 457–458; progress in work of improving, 508–509, II. 16–27, 237, 248; protection of, by congress, 349, 351, 357, 368.

Pennsylvania House, the, I. 517.

Pennsylvania Railroad Co., builds line to Washington, II. 546.

People's Tippecanoe Ball, II. 269.

Perseverance Fire Engine Co., I. 558 n., II. 243.

Persico, Luigi, sculptor employed in capitol, II. 33; design for tympanum of east entrance made by, 43.

Pestalozzian principle, school conducted on, II. 208.

Peter, Major George, I. 622.

Peter, John, nominated register of wills for Washington County, I. 403; appointment not carried out by Jefferson, 412; mayor of Georgetown, 596, 623; on Monroe inaugural committee, II. 33.

Peter, Robert, Georgetown merchant and mayor, I. 66, 100, 109, 135 n., 275 n.; protests against unexpected area of federal city, 138, 143–144; one of incorporators of Georgetown Bridge Co., 171; houses of, leased by British ministers, 574; large landowner, II. 96.

Peter, Thomas, an incorporator of Bank of Columbia, I. 223; house of, on K Street, 346–347; President Adams entertained at house of, 349; house called Tudor Place built for, on Q Street, 572.

Pettit, Richard, on board of directors of Georgetown Gas Co., II. 301 n.

Petworth, John Tayloe's farm, I. 609.

Peyton, Francis, I. 397 n.; colonel of Alexandria County militia, 565.

Phelps, Seth L., President Grant appoints commissioner, II. 632 n.

Phenix Gazette, II. 173 n.

Philadelphia, affair of the mutinous soldiers at, I. 8–11, 14; removal of congress to Princeton from, 11; decided upon as the seat of government until removal of capital to new federal district, 38–39, 115; continued hopes of, to remain permanent seat of government, 43; house built in, for occupancy of president and plans of, for retaining seat of government, 116, 139–140; features of city plan of, favored by Jefferson, 117; objections from, to national aid to city of Washington, 269; yellow fever epidemic in (1797), 305; removal of departments to Washington from, 350–353; resolution providing for removal of seat of government from Washington back to, 465; efforts to remove seat of government to, after burning of public buildings in Washington, 633–634; city council's treatment of gas company project in 1822, II. 15–16.

Philip, William H., on committee for city government plan, II. 572 n.

Phillips, George W., assistant United States marshal, imprisonment of, II. 488.

Phillips, Samuel L., connection of, with code of 1872, II. 631 n.

Physicians in Washington, early, I. 324, II. 30, 31.

Pickett, James A., editor of *National Monument*, II. 422 n.

Pickrell, Adolphus H., on board of directors of Georgetown Gas Co., II. 301 n.

Pierce, Franklin, II. 307, 311, 404, 422–423.

Pierce, Joshua, tree nursery of, II. 193.

Pierson, Charles, director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.

Pinckney, Charles, submits section relating to federal district in the constitution, I. 20–21.

Pinckney, Charles, proprietor of *Sun*, II. 228.

Piscataway Parish, Md., establishment of, I. 81.

Pithean Base-ball Club, **II.** 495 n.

Plan of federal city, Jefferson's, **I.** 129–131; L'Enfant's first, 135–136; Ellicott's engraved map, 144–145; L'Enfant's "large plan" or "original plan," 147–150, 176–178; L'Enfant's completed plan, submitted to Washington, 153–154; completion of L'Enfant's, by Ellicott, and first map engraved from, 173–176; changes from that of L'Enfant shown in drawing completed in 1792, 184–186; Robert King's, 318 n.

Plants of the District, catalogues of, **II.** 27, 28.

Plumbe Popular Magazine, **II.** 409 n.

Poe, O. M., member of Scientific Club, **II.** 328 n.

Poinsett, Joel R., quoted, **II.** 316 n.

Poland, Luke P., presents reports on federal relation to District, **II.** 625, 626.

Police board, members of, appointed by President Grant, **II.** 581 n.

Police force, **II.** 144, 148; reorganization of, 402–404; politics and, 429–433; federalized, 457–460.

Police protection, of capitol, **I.** 547–549, **II.** 43; inadequate, 242, 272–273, 429–430; discussion of bill for, 273–274; night force established, 274; slight need for day force, 274–275; given to gamblers, 432–433; during war time, 480; congress enacts law for federal, 482.

Politics, newspapers and, **II.** 224–233; partisan, 253–258; local, preceding Civil War, 454–463.

Polk, Charles P., 408 n.

Polk, James K., president, **II.** 405.

Pomeroy, S. C., trustee of Freedmen's Bureau, **II.** 556.

Poorhouse, provisions for, **I.** 541–542, **II.** 220.

Poor relief, measures for, **I.** 540–544, **II.** 217–221; legislation regarding, 337–342; government makes annual appropriations for, 524.

Pope, Thomas and Francis, early landholders, **I.** 53.

Pope stone episode, **II.** 403–404.

Popular vote, mayor elected by, **II.** 160 n., 161.

Population, statistics of, in 1800, **I.** 355–356; of Washington in 1803 and 1807, 466; increase of Washington in, 499; rate of growth of, **II.** 276.

Porter, General Andrew, summoned for contempt, **II.** 488.

Porter, Commodore David, residence of, **II.** 5, 216.

Porter, Rufus, editor of *Aerial Reporter*, **II.** 422 n.

Post, Rev. Reuben, pastor of First Presbyterian Church, **II.** 185.

Postmaster, occupants of office, **I.** 170 n., 261, 262, 263, 345, **II.** 34, 165, 166 n., 192, 224, 247 n., 284, 285, 431, 548.

Post-office, establishment and early years of, in Washington, **I.** 261–263; location of, in Blodgett Hotel building, 528, 631 n.; congress provides for erection of, **II.** 247–248; location of, discussed, 284–285.

Post-office department, opening of, in Washington, **I.** 350–351; spared by British invaders, 628, 631.

Potomac Advocate, Georgetown paper, **II.** 228 n.

Potomac Base-ball Club, **II.** 495 n.

Potomac City, colored settlement, **II.** 557.

Potomac Club, **II.** 327.

Potomac Co., the, **I.** 29, 32, 64; chartering of, 68; work accomplished by, 69; shares of, given by Washington toward founding a national university, 251; progress of work by, 274–275; volume of business handled by, 275; work of, stops on account of lack of money, 498.

Potomac district, creation of the, **I.** 423.

Potomac Flats, malaria from, **II.** 309.

Potomac Flats Case, decision in the, **I.** 250.

Potomac Light Infantry, **II.** 453.

Potomac Lodge of Masons, Georgetown, **I.** 204 n., 206 n., 214 n., 617 n.

Potomac region, bargain by which federal seat was secured for, **I.** 41–43; early settlement of lands in, 44; creation of counties of, 44–45; character of settlers, 45–46; traces of Indian inhabitants, 46–48; richness of country in game and fertility of soil, 48–49; slowness in rise of towns, 55–56; importance of tobacco in commercial life of, 56–57; social life, 60–61; effects of French and Indian war on country, 64–66.

Potomac River, desire of southern members of congress to locate permanent seat of government on, **I.** 16, 29; plan to locate a temporary capital on, 17; improvement of, to render available for commerce, 29–30; passage of law locating seat of government on, 38–39; description of region along the, 44 ff.; exploration of, by Captain John Smith and by Henry Fleete, 47; need for development of, recognized by Washington, 63–64; account of early efforts to improve river for navigation, 67–68; extent of improvement of, by Potomac Co., 69; volume of trade on, 70; bridges over the, 243, 427–430, 441, 491–492, 493, 497, 502, 505–507; congressional appropriations for improvement of, II. 131; ceases to be navigable for large vessels above Alexandria, 106, 155; aqueduct built across, 110–111; surveys and chart of, 310.

Potomac Steamboat Co., I. 538–539.

Potomac Water Co., opposition of, to city water supply, II. 306.

Potter, Henry, school for colored children opened by, II. 137 n.

Powder magazines, Washington, I. 527.

Powhatan Indians, I. 47.

Prentiss, Charles, newspaper publisher, I. 366 n.

Presbyterian Church, in the Potomac region, I. 82–84; beginnings of, in District, 232; progress of, 599-601.

"Presidential palace," origin of term with L'Enfant, I. 149–150.

President's house, location selected for, by L'Enfant, I. 150; premiums advertised for plans for, 187; premium for best plan won by James Hoban, 195; progress in building of, and laying of corner-stone, 204; plans prepared for buildings to be added to, as wings, for use of departments, 306; progress of work on, 313; use of name White House for, 313 n.; appropriation for providing furniture for, 340; incomplete condition of, upon arrival of President Adams and family, 376; condition at time of Jefferson's occupancy, 405; first public reception in, Fourth of July, 1801, 406; clearing of grounds about, and building of fence, 419; deliberate progress in work of completion, 458–460; first published prints of, 617; burning of, by British, 627.

Press representatives, early provisions for, in congress, II. 177, 235.

Price, Captain Thomas, I. 75.

Prince George County, Md., original extent of, I. 45.

Princeton, N. J., suggested as seat of national capital, I. 4; removal of congress from Philadelphia to, 11; deficiencies as a meeting-place of congress, 13.

Prince William County, Va., original extent of, I. 45.

Printers, congressional, II. 227.

Printers' organizations in Washington, I. 598.

Printing and engraving, bureau of, established, II. 540–541.

Printing offices in early Washington, I. 383, 435.

Prison, military, II. 481.

Prison Discipline Society, II. 92.

Prison inspectors, first board of, II. 87.

Private banks in District, I. 432–433.

Private schools in Washington, I. 485, II. 205–209.

Privy pits, prohibition of, I. 562.

Proprietors of lands within federal district, I. 49–56, 146–147.

Prospect Hill Cemetery, II. 314.

Proudfit, S. V., collection of stone implements by, I. 48 n.

Prout, William, original proprietor, I. 135 n., 372; member of city hall erection commission, II. 79 n.; connection of, with Navy Yard Bridge Co., 99 n.

Prussian government, legation building owned by, II. 620.

Pryor, Roger A., connection of, with *Union*, II. 425.

Public buildings, erection of, II. 315–316.

Public health, improving conditions of, II. 11–13, 309–317.

Public improvement work put in charge of army officer, II. 632.

Public lots, sale of, II. 17–18; inadequate amount received from sale of, 22–23. *See also* Auction.

Public money, first appropriation of, for purpose not governmental, II. 128.

Public printing, and newspapers, II. 407–415, 423–427; connection between, broken, 442–443; congress reduces rate for, 409; competition for, 410; first superintendent of, 427.

Public schools, II. 204–209, 372–373.

Public squares, United States pays proportion toward improvement of, II. 19.

Pumps in early Washington, I. 562.

Punishment, old-time laws of, I. 425, II. 10, 83–84.

Purcell, Redmond, charges against Hadfield by, I. 315.

Purcell, William F., judge of Orphans' Court, II. 519 n.

Purdy, John, partner in City Savings Bank, II. 258 n.

Q

Quakers, meeting-house built by, in Washington, I. 606.

Quarries bought for material for public buildings of Washington, I. 169, 231, 411, II. 36.

Queen, Nicholas L., hotel proprietor, I. 519 n., II. 60.

R

Race meetings in Washington, I. 609–611.

Rafinesque, C. S., first list of District plants made by, II. 28 n.

Railroads, as new form of transportation, II. 115; competition of, with stage-coach lines, 117–118; route of, 118–120; terminus of, 120, 121; development of, 131–132, 345–356; discussion and adjustment of rates on, 358–359; taxation of, 360; facilities of, deficient, 543–546.

Ralph, Rev. George, rector of Christ Episcopal Church, I. 258, 260; school opened by, 261; resignation of, to become principal of Charlotte Hall School, 302.

Ralston, Alexander, surveyor, I. 240–241.

Ramsay, Dennis, suit brought by, to secure commission as justice of the peace, I. 410.

Ramsay, G. W. D., II. 262 n.

Randall, Dr. Richard, connection of, with Columbian Medical School, II. 201 n.

Randolph, John, on the clashing interests in the District, I. 444; bloodless duel of, with Henry Clay, II. 54; arraigns traffic in slaves, 135.

Rapid transit in 1826, II. 103–104.

Rapine, Conrad, and Co., I. 383, 435, 436, 516, 595.

Rapine, Daniel, bookseller, publisher, and mayor of Washington, I. 467–468, 595, II. 161, 427 n.

Rathbone, Major, with President Lincoln at time of assassination, II. 537.

Ray, James, I. 293, 322.

Real estate, values in 1821–1825, II. 22–24; improvement in market for, 618, 619; speculative movement in, 619; charge of officials' connection with pool in, 623–624.

Recorder of Deeds, office of, created, II. 521.

Record office for District, removal of, to Washington, I. 360.

Records, storing of government, I. 528.

Reedy Branch, stream known as, I. 561.

Reeside, John E., owner of Union Line of omnibuses, II. 362.

Reformatory measures for juveniles, congress provides for, II. 87.

Reformer, Duff Green's newspaper, II. 229.

Register of the city, office of, removed to city hall, II. 80, 81 n.

Register of Debates, published by Gales and Seaton, II. 176–177; abandoned, 226.

Register of wills for District of Columbia, created by law of 1801, I. 401, II. 77 n.

Reid, Whitelaw, Alexander R. Shepherd brings libel proceedings against, II. 623 n.

Reintzell, Daniel, mayor of Georgetown, I. 275 n., 596 n.

Religious conditions in early Virginia and Maryland, I. 79–88. *See* Churches.

Removal of seat of government to Washington, death of General Washington previous to, I. 338; acquiescent attitude of congress toward matter of, and passage of removal bill, 339–340; issuance of executive order fixing date of, 341; Washington at time of the, 342–347, 353 ff., 357–386; expense of removal of departments, 351–353; slight notice taken of, in newspapers, 357; local celebration of first meeting of congress in new city, 374–375.

Renner, Daniel, rope manufacturer, I. 527 n.

Reporters, places on floor of house assigned to, II. 177; provision for, in senate, 235.

Reports of discussions in congress, the first, I. 436–437.

Republic, President Taylor's organ, II. 417.

Republican association of Washington, II. 392.
Republican Citizens' Inaugural ball (1833), II. 236.
Republican party, beginning of, II. 391, 392; first appearance of, at national election, 428; increase in membership of, 456; mob attack on headquarters of, 456.
Republican Wigwam, II. 455.
Reservations, designation of the uses of, I. 254, 276 ff., 324–329; effect on property values of proximity to, 463; use of, for agricultural purposes, 511–512, 513–514; United States pays proportion toward improvement of, II. 19.
Reservoirs for storing water for use against fires, I. 559.
Reservoir Street, opening of, II. 130.
Residence law, origin of, I. 1 ff.; passage of, 36–40.
Residential section, growth of, II. 191–193.
Retrocession of District, first suggestion of, I. 440; small minority of congress in favor of, 441; debates on resolution, 444, 447–448; leading arguments for, 445, 448; defeat of later resolution (1805), 448; idea of removal associated with, 448; bad effect of agitation, on land values, 448–449; urged as a solution of political problem presented by the District, 463–464; agitation for, based on inconvenience of Washington as a place of residence, 464–465; causes leading to retrocession of Virginia portion of District in 1846, 544–545, II. 259–268.
Rhees, William J., instrumental in organizing Y. M. C. A., II. 434.
Rhodes, William, hotel keeper, I. 313, 380.
Rhodes Spring, ransacked by confederates, II. 473.
Rhodes' tavern, orphans' court first meets in, I. 414; mentioned, 517.
Rice, Henry M., residence of, II. 446.
Rice, Luther, Baptist missionary, II. 198–199, 200.
Rich, William, *American Botanical Register* edited by, II. 28.
Richards, A. C., superintendent of police, II. 558.
Richards, Rev. Lewis, Baptist minister, I. 408.
Richards, Zalmon, principal of Columbian College preparatory school, II. 378; first superintendent of schools, 507 n.
Richmond, Christopher, second postmaster of Washington, I. 262–263.
Richmond, John, school opened by, I. 301.
Ridgeley, Charles, horse owner, I. 304.
Ridgway, Robert, duel fought by, II. 55 n.
Riggs, Elisha, residence of, II. 620 n.
Riggs, George W., member of Washington Horticultural Society, II. 194 n.; connection with street railway enterprise, 365 n.; head of board of trade, 542; on committee for city government plan, 572 n.
Rind, Joshua N., buys *Columbian Gazette*, II. 227.
Rind, Samuel S., publisher of *Columbian*, II. 179.
Rind, William, newspaper publisher, I. 95.
Rind, William A., buys *Columbian Gazette*, II. 228.
Rind, William A., Jr., publisher of *Metropolitan*, II. 179.
Rind, W. A., and Co., publishers of the *Federalist*, II. 178.
Rind, W. A., Georgetown printer, I. 596.
Ring Club House, II. 608.
Ringgold, Tench, rope factory of, I. 527; member of commission in charge of rebuilding of public edifices, 636; appointed marshal of the District, II. 34–35, 57; Adams inaugural ceremonies in charge of, 171; treasurer of Georgetown Savings Institution, 195 n.; at Jackson inauguration, 213; removal of, as marshal, 224–225.
Ritchie, Thomas, first editor of *Washington Union*, II. 407–408, 415 n., 421.
Ritchie and Heiss, public printers, II. 410.
Rittenhouse Academy, II. 377.
River deposits, peril of, to public health, II. 310–311.
River improvement, beginning of congressional appropriations for, II. 131.
Rives, John C., owner and editor of *Globe*, II. 226, 254, 412, 413; fails of election to board of aldermen, 254; appropriation of, for needy families during civil war, 477.
Roach, Edward N., registrar of wills, II. 519 n.

Roach, James, II. 262 n.

Roads, early conditions as to, in Potomac region, I. 61–63; building of, from capital to other cities and towns, 515–516, 532–535; improvement of, II. 100–103, 342–345.

Robbins, Zenas C., on board of police commissioners, II. 487 n.; registrar of wills, 519 n.

Roberdeau, Isaac, I. 166.

Robertson, James, editor of *The Truth*, II. 426 n.

Robinson, H. H., editor of *Daily Times*, II. 408 n.

Robinson, W. E., II. 415 n.

Roche, James R., II. 521 n.

Rochelle, Roux de, residence of, II. 192.

Rock Creek, early settlement of region along, I. 49 ff.; bridges across, 189–190, 242–243, 359–360, 493; early navigability of, 190 n.

Rock Creek Church Cemetery, II. 314.

Rock Creek Church Road, I. 63.

Rock Creek Parish, I. 81.

Rockville, Frederick County, Md., I. 73, 77, 78, 112.

Rockville Road, the, I. 63.

Rodgers, Commodore John, residence of, II. 191–192.

Rogers, Charles, I. 408 n.

Rogers, Henry J., Baltimore telegraph office in charge of, II. 367.

Rome, tract of land called, owned by Pope family, I. 53.

Rope walks, Washington, I. 527.

Rosedale, tract of land owned by Uriah Forrest, I. 413.

Ross, British general in invasion of Washington, I. 626, 627.

Ross, David, auditor of accounts of commissioners, I. 224.

Rothwell, Andrew, third digest of laws of city corporation edited by, II. 11; publisher of weekly magazine, 179 n.; vice-president of Franklin Temperance Society, 222 n.

Rotunda, building called the, II. 197.

Rough and Ready Clubs, II. 416.

Rowles, Joseph E., I. 530.

Royall, Anne, *Paul Pry* edited by, II. 232; as common scold, 233; editor of *Huntress*, 233.

Ruff, George R., on committee for street improvement, II. 501.

Rugby Academy, II. 378.

Rush, Benjamin, quoted, concerning movement to make Princeton the permanent seat of government, I. 4; Fourth of July oration by, 611; President Madison with, during British occupation of Washington, 629.

Rush, Richard, coöperation of, in western canal enterprise, II. 108.

Ryan's Chapel in Uniontown, II. 371.

Ryland Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.

S

Sabbath restrictions in Washington, Georgetown, and Alexandria, I. 488–490, II. 401, 402.

Saddler's sign in Washington, I. 500 n.

Sage, P. A., and Co., German newspaper published by, II. 283.

St. Aloysius Catholic Church, Washington, date of erection, II. 285 n.

St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Washington, I. 382, 599, 600.

St. Charles Hotel, II. 445 n.

St. Dominic Catholic Church, Washington, date of erection, II. 285 n.

St. John's Catholic Church, Forest Glen, Md., I. 85.

St. John's College, Annapolis, establishment of, I. 89.

St. John's Episcopal Church, Georgetown, I. 88, 603, 604, II. 186.

St. John's Episcopal Church, Washington, II. 6; corner-stone laid by Grand Lodge of Masons, 80 n.; presidents attend, 181, 182, 183 n.; bell erected in steeple of, 185 n.

St. John's German Evangelical Lutheran Church, Washington, date of erection, II. 285 n.

St. John's Institute, II. 377 n.

St. Mary's Catholic Church, Washington, I. 603, II. 189, 283.

St. Mary's German Catholic Church, Washington, date of erection, II. 285 n.

St. Matthew's Church, Washington, II. 190.

St. Memim, miniature painter, in Washington, I. 583.

St. Patrick's Catholic Church, Washington, I. 382, 559 n., 605, II. 189, 190.

St. Paul's English Lutheran Church, Washington, newspapers placed in corner-stone of, II. 282; as German enterprise, 283; date of erection, 285 n.

St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church South, Washington, II. 393.

St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, II. 189.
St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, II. 207, 219.
Salaries, increase in, of government officials and employés, II. 69–76.
Sale of city lots in Washington, the first, I. 150, 159–163; L'Enfant's opposition to plan of, 151–152; second, 204–205; third, 213; in 1800, 362; after removal of seat of government to Washington, 415–416, II. 21–23.
Sanford, Alexander, proprietor of Washington Hotel, II. 59 n.
Sargent, John O., editor of *Republic*, II. 417.
Sargent, Nathan, on committee for street improvement, II. 501.
Saturday Evening Mail, II. 426 n.
Saturday Evening News and District General Advertiser, II. 409 n.
Saul, John, secretary of Washington Horticultural Society, II. 194 n.; on park commission under Shepherd rule, 601 n.
Saunders, William, on park commission under Shepherd rule, II. 601.
Savage, George, temperance society formed by, II. 395.
Savings bank, first, in District, II. 195, 258.
Sayrs, Rev. John J., I. 604.
Schaeffer, F. B., captain of National Rifles, II. 452 n.
Schaeffer, George C., member of Scientific Club, II. 328 n.
Schaer, Rudolph, private school of, II. 208.
Schenck, Robert C., on committee for Grant inaugural ceremonies, II. 572 n.
School, petition for a, in Washington, I. 226; Rev. Mr. Ralph's, 261; opening of, for free colored children, II. 137.
School boards, consolidation of, II. 630 n.
School building policy, II. 506–510.
Schools, conditions as to, in early Maryland and Virginia, I. 88–91; the first, in the District, 301–302; increase in number of, 335–336; in 1800, 382 n.; provision for public, in Washington, 474 ff.; board of trustees chosen for, 479; opening of the Western School and the Eastern Academy, 481–482; school hours, and compensation of teachers, 483; lack of adequate funds for maintaining, 483–484; opening of school on Lancaster plan, 484, II. 203; matter of class distinction in, I. 484–485; early public and private, II. 202–209.
School system, congress petitioned for aid to provide, II. 372–378; for colored children, 378–379, 389, 524–528.
Schreiner, C. W., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.
Schutzen Park, II. 591.
Scientific Club, II. 328.
Scientific research, early, II. 30, 327.
Scientific Societies, II. 27–31, 193, 194, 326, 327, 328.
Scotland Yard, tract of land called, I. 50.
Scott, Gustavus, I. 54, 68; appointed member of board of commissioners of federal city, 237–238; residence bought in District by, 240; builds and occupies house in District, 287; death of, 413 n.
Scott, General Winfield, defeated Whig candidate, II. 422; directed to protect capitol, 461, 462, 464.
Scott's Tavern (Little Hotel), I. 279–280.
Seal for city of Washington, provided by city council, I. 472.
Seaton, Mayor William Winton, I. 587 n., II. 4 n., 13 n., 318, 323 n.; reception given by, in honor of Lafayette, 51; mayor of Washington, 167, 254, 292, 332, 404 n., 427 n., 554; proprietor of *Intelligencer*, 175, 177, 415 n., 427 n.; member of Columbian Horticultural Society, 193; president of Howard Society, 217 n.; vice-president of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.; presides at citizens' meeting, 259; address of welcome of, to General Harrison, 270; General Harrison guest of, 271; advice of, against Whig bank measure demonstration, 272; quoted on Smithsonian Institute, 323 n.; death of, 573 n. *See* Gales and Seaton.
Seaton School, II. 508 n.
Secession movement, II. 453.
Second Baptist Church, Washington, I. 604–605, II. 189.
Second Presbyterian Church, Washington, corner-stone laid by Grand Lodge of Masons, II. 80 n.; President Adams attendant at, 181, 182.
Sedgwick, Theodore, speaker of house, I. 380.

Selden, William, marshal of the District, II. 386 n., 442 n.
Semmes, Joseph M., hotel keeper, I. 518.
Senate, social status of, agreed upon, II. 53; provision made by, for printing reports, 411, 424 n.
Senate chamber, description of, in 1800, I. 378; oath of office administered to President Jefferson in, 404; galleries in, II. 41.
Sentinel. See *Washington Sentinel.*
Serurier, M., French minister, I. 583; quoted on British invasion of Washington, 614, 627; in Washington at time of British invasion, 627.
Sessford, John, "the volunteer annalist," II. 13 n.
Seven Buildings, the, I. 414.
Seventh Street, opening of, I. 531.
Sewall, Robert, house of, which was burned by British, I. 312–313, 626.
Sewall, Dr. Thomas, on Columbian College faculty, II. 200 n., 201 n.; on city hospital staff, 340 n.
Seward, William H., cited on inadequate police protection, II. 431; attacked by Lewis Payne, 537–538.
Sewerage, lack of, II. 303–305, 308; Secretary Usher's plan for, 498; plan for, under Shepherd rule, 600–601.
Seymour, William F., on board of directors of Georgetown Gas Co., II. 301 n.
Shaaf, Dr. John T., II. 12 n.
Shaers, R., schoolmaster, religious services conducted by, II. 183.
Sharpe, A. R., marshal of District, II. 585.
Shaw, W. S., secretary of President Adams, I. 347.
Shea, John G., cited, I. 47 n., 91.
Shepherd, Alexander R., on committee for street improvement, II. 501–502; on committee for city government plan, 572 n.; territorial form of government proposed by, 574; building operations of, 588; leader in city improvements, 595; lavish expenditures under rule of, 595–598; trustee of Washington Club, 608 n.; active in General Grant's second campaign, 619; erects residence, 620–621; President Grant appoints governor, 622; brings libel proceedings against editors, 623; city improvement by, commended, 629; appointment of, as commissioner, rejected, 631; tribute to, 632–633; statue erected in memory of, 633; effect of plan of, on present form of government, 641–642.
Shepherdstown, Va., interest of people of, in securing federal seat, I. 114, 119.
Sheridan, George A., Recorder of Deeds, II. 521 n.
Sherman, John, 491; on city government problem, II. 575.
Sherman, General W. T., fleeing slaves cared for by, II. 523; General Grant's house presented to, 574.
"Shin-bone" canvases, in rotunda of capitol, II. 42.
Shuck, Frederick, Washington Public Baths established by, I. 517 n.
Sickles, Daniel E., Key shot by, II. 387 n.; trial of, 441.
Sidewalks, building of, in Washington, I. 509; in 1815, 635; need of improvement in, II. 16–17; assessment for, 17 n.
Sidney, S. H. Smith's farm, I. 573.
Sim, Theodore, member of Jackson central committee, II. 210 n.
Sim, Dr. Thomas, II. 12 n.
Simmes, Charles, I. 414 n.
Simmons, William, bill of, for removal to Washington, I. 353.
Simms, Edward, partner in City Savings Bank, II. 258 n.
Sisters of the Convent of Visitation, Young Ladies' Seminary opened by, II. 208.
Sixth Street, opening of, I. 532.
Sixth Street Presbyterian Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.
Skinner, J. L., publisher of *Columbian Register*, II. 179 n.
Slave labor, use of, in building operations at Washington, I. 232; attention given to laborers by commissioners, 323.
Slavery, contest over, II. 133–145; conditions due to, 379–383; the churches and, 390–393.
Slaves, the District as a central point for trade in, I. 425; continuance of trade in, until abolition from District in 1850, 426; percentage of population of District represented by, 448; taxation of, to discourage sending of, into District, 488; proportion of, to white population and free negroes in Washington and Maryland, 548 n., II. 136, 378; fears of uprising of, II. 135; practice of selling free men as, 139.

Slave trade, District, II. 384–388.

Smallwood, R., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.

Smallwood, Mayor Samuel N., I. 323; member of city hall erection commission, II. 79 n.; connection of, with Navy Yard Bridge Co., 99 n.; mayor of Washington, 161, 162.

Smith, Charles Maurice, editor of *Sentinel*, II. 424 n.

Smith, Captain John, explorations of, up the Potomac River, I. 47.

Smith, John A., government buys land of, for water supply, II. 239; clerk of circuit court, 439.

Smith, John Cotton, account of city of Washington by, quoted, I. 357–358, 379, 380.

Smith, John L., editor of *National Whig*, II. 232 n.

Smith, General Samuel, I. 372.

Smith, Samuel Harrison, newspaper publisher, I. 90, 365; elected school trustee, 479; director of Washington Library Co., 521 n.; farm occupied by, 573; success of *National Intelligencer* due to, 587; charter member of Columbian Institute, II. 29 n., 31; congressional reporter for *Intelligencer*, 177; residence of, 191; bank associations of, 194; treasurer of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.

Smith, Mrs. Samuel Harrison, impression made upon, by city of Washington, I. 354–355; cited, 379 n., 380, 381, 382, 405, 406, 407, 462, 573, 580, 624, 629; quoted, 582–583, II. 211, 216; donates novel for poor relief, 221.

Smith, Walter, I. 75; an incorporator of Georgetown Lancaster School Society, 484 n.; on commission to select penitentiary site, II. 88 n.; in command of militia, 145 n.

Smith, Dr. Walter, I. 324 n.

Smith, William R., botanic garden in charge of, II. 327 n.; on park commission under Shepherd rule, 601 n.

Smithsonian Institution, II. 31, 323, 325, 331, 332.

Smoot, George W., II. 262 n.

Smoot, S. S., trustee of Washington Club, II. 608 n.

Snead, Augustine, first woman Washington correspondent, II. 585 n.

Snethen, Worthington G., editor of *National Whig*, II. 417 n.

Snow, Beverly, mob in search of, II. 145.

Snow, Chauncey H., one of owners of *Intelligencer*, II. 573 n.

Snowden, Alexander, newspaper publisher, I. 369.

Snowden, S., one of proprietors of *Alexandria Gazette*, II. 173 n.

Social life in Washington, I. 381–382, 575–578, II. 45, 47–55, 250–252, 275–276, 444–450.

Social reform, II. 579–587.

Society of Friends, assistance of, for school for colored girls, II. 389.

Soldiers' Home, II. 337.

Solomon, A. S., on committee for Grant inaugural ceremonies, II. 572 n.

Sons of Hibernia, I. 500 n.

Soup house, opened for poor relief, II. 217.

Southard, Samuel L., Ewell residence occupied by, II. 7 n.; secretary of the navy, 171; president of Howard Society, 217 n.

Southern Press, II. 418, 424.

South portico of White House built, II. 64.

South Washington, II. 284, 286, 287.

South Washington Church, II. 189; date of erection, 285 n.

Sparks, Jared, elected chaplain of house of representatives, II. 184.

Spectator, Calhoun's newspaper organ, II. 280, 281, 282.

Speculation in land in federal city, feared by Washington, I. 123 n.; beginning and increase of, 146 ff.; transactions of the Greenleaf-Morris combination, 216–222, 234–237, 243 ff., 256–259, 278–281; last days of leading men who lost through, 553–556; by California syndicate, II. 619.

Spencer, George E., objects to commission government for District, II. 638.

Spirit of Seventy-Six, semi-weekly newspaper, I. 587 n., 589, 590.

Spoils system, absence of changes due to, in early Washington, I. 439.

Springs in Washington, I. 559–560.

Squatters on public reservations, I. 511–512, 513–514.

Stage-coach, gives way to steam, II. 117.

Stage lines, established between Baltimore and Georgetown, I. 335; establishment of, in 1800, 363–364; established between Georgetown and Washington, II. 238.

Stamp Act troubles in Maryland and Virginia, I. 71–72.

Stanton, Edwin M., council for Daniel Sickles, II. 441.

Stanton Town, colored settlement, II. 557.

Star, The, II. 392, 419, 422 n., 424, 443 n., 455 n., 463.

"Star-Spangled Banner," first singing of, in Washington, I. 636 n.

State department building, II. 68 n.

States, Democratic paper, II. 424, 442, 443; change of name, 443 n.

States and Union, II. 443 n., 455 n.; discontinuance of, 462–463.

Staughton, Dr. James M., on Columbian College faculty, II. 200 n., 201 n.

Staughton, Rev. William, elected president of Columbian College, II. 199 n.; resignation of, 201.

Steam, introduction of, on Potomac, II. 102; growth of, as factor in transportation, 131.

Steamboat, Fitch's invention of, I. 198; Fulton's invention, 580, 581, 582.

Steamboat Hotel, II. 104.

Steamboat line, established between Washington and Aquia Creek, II. 102.

Steamboats, the first, on the Potomac, I. 538–539; suburban service of, II. 371.

Steam cars, celebration in honor of, II. 117.

Stedman, E. C., in government service, II. 542.

Steele, Horatio N., chief of police, II. 403 n.

Steiner, Bernard C., work by, cited, I. 77, 92.

Stelle, Pontius D., tavern keeper, I. 343–344, 519 n.

Stelle's Tavern, I. 380; dancing assemblies at, 381.

Stenographers, places on floor of house assigned to, II. 177.

Stephenson, Clotworthy, I. 383 n., 419–420, 433.

Stewart, Philip, member of Jackson central committee, II. 210 n.; veteran of the Revolution, 214 n.

Stewart, General Walter, I. 244.

Stewart, William M., opposes World's Fair in Washington, II. 591–592; property interests of, 620.

Stickney, William, II. 370.

Stinckney, John, nephew of Samuel Blodgett, I. 553 n.

Stockwell, John, II. 230 n.

Stoddard, John, I. 109.

Stoddert, Benjamin, merchant and landowner of Georgetown, I. 54, 97, 109, 135 n.; account of commercial conditions at Georgetown by, 98–100; house of, 100 n.; correspondence of Washington with, relative to federal city, 123, 125, 127, 128; a protestant against unexpected area of federal city, 138, 144; an incorporator of Bank of Columbia, 223; appointed secretary of navy, 330; an incorporator of Anacostia Bridge Company, 336; bridge built across Anacostia Creek at expense of, 492; hopes of, concerning Georgetown as a trade centre, 497; career of, ended in debt, 555.

Stoddert's Spring, Washington, I. 560.

Stone, Colonel Charles P., District militia organized by, II. 464.

Stone, W. I., map by, I. 561 n.

Stone, Mrs. W. I., map engraved by, II. 3 n.

Stone, William J., opposition of, to court bill, II. 519.

Stover, Mrs., President Johnson's daughter, II. 581.

Stowe, Calvin E., presides at Council of Congregational Church, II. 391.

Stowe, Harriet Beecher, contributor to *Era*, II. 391.

Street improvement and taxpayers, II. 293–294.

Street lighting, I. 419, 509, II. 14–16, 295, 300, 302.

Street railways, development of, II. 363–366; charter for, secured, 491, 590; operation of, 492; exclusion of colored people from cars, prohibited, 530–531; annual dividend paid by, 616–617.

Street signs, use of, begun, II. 26–27, 491.

Streets, progress in opening of, in Washington, I. 507–509, 523–524, 531–532; payment for improvements, by local taxpayers rather than the general government, 509–510, 512; congress attempts improvement of, II. 16–26; city appropriation for, 98; grading of, 284, 308; paving of, 293–295, 496–498, 568; unimproved condition of, 317–319; need of federal aid for, 320–322; improvements in, 330, 446–447; Secretary Usher's plan for improvement of, 498; legislative problems relating to, 499–506; failure of plan for, 554–555; improvement in, under Mayor

Bowen, 566–567; under Shepherd rule, 601, 602, 604.

Stretch, Joseph, director of Washington Library Co., I. 521 n.

Strother, John, hotel keeper, II. 14 n.; proprietor of Mansion Hotel, 59; of City Hotel, 59 n.

Strother's Hotel, II. 14; first civic procession starts from, 80.

Stuart, Dr. David, appointed commissioner of federal district, I. 120–121; qualifications of, for position, 122; difficulties of, over L'Enfant and his plan, 157; quoted in connection with auction sale of city lots, 159, 160–161; report of, on farm lands in vicinity of District, 172–173; retires from position as commissioner, 211, 237.

Stuart, Gilbert, in Washington, I. 583.

Suburban Movement, II. 368–372.

Suffrage, extension of, proposed, II. 255–256; granted, 290; negro, 546–550; woman, 579–580.

Sugar factory built in Washington, I. 292, 304; failure of, 434.

Sumner, Charles, on civil rights of colored people, II. 531; bill providing for negro social equality introduced by, 557.

Sun, newspaper organ for Hugh L. White, II. 228, 229.

Sunday, agitation against opening markets on, I. 488–489; other legislation tending to observance of, 489–490, II. 401, 402.

Sunday Chronicle, II. 462.

Sunderland, Thomas, property interests of, II. 620.

Superintendent of the city, office of, abolished, II. 34.

Supreme Court, removal of, to Washington, I. 370; decision of, concerning commissions executed by Adams but withheld by Jefferson, 410; meeting-place of, on basement floor of capitol building, 454–455; temporary room in capitol used as meeting-place of, II. 37 n.; first use of permanent quarters, 39; salaries of judges of, 71.

Supreme Court of the District, circuit court replaced by, II. 440; established, 518; powers and jurisdiction, 519.

Surratt, Mrs., confederate of Booth in Lincoln conspiracy, II. 538; hanging of, 539.

Surveying department of Washington, list of principal men employed in, I. 300 n. *See* L'Enfant *and* Ellicott.

Surveyor of Washington, office of, I. 418, II. 2–3, 78.

Susquehanna River, rivalry between Potomac and, for site of permanent seat of government, I. 29, 31, 33.

Suter, Mrs., boarding-house keeper, I. 518.

Suter's Tavern, Georgetown, I. 132; opening of theatre in, 334, 335.

Swann, Thomas, nominated attorney for District by President Adams, I. 402; fails of appointment by Jefferson, 412; admitted as attorney by circuit court, 424 n.; residence of, II. 8.

Swartout, Samuel, emissary of Burr arrested for treason, I. 584.

Sweeney, George, opinion of, on proposed railroad route, II. 120; candidate for mayor, 165.

Swisshelm, Mrs. Jane, women's rights advocate, II. 580.

T

Talisman and Odd Fellows Magazine, The, II. 409 n.

Tasistro, L. F., II. 415 n.; translator in state department, 541.

Tate, Joseph B., owner of *Telegraph*, II. 420.

Taxation, assessment by levy court of Washington County, I. 421; rate of, and amount realized from (1803), 469; discrimination in favor of unimproved property under early system of, 469–470; both personal and real property subject to, 470; exemptions in Georgetown and in Washington, 470–471; citizens of city of Washington relieved from assessment by levy court of county, 471; freedom of government property from, 471; effort to apply part of proceeds of, to support of public schools, 474–476; of slaves in Washington, 488; for building sidewalks, 509; increase in rate of, in 1808, 1824, and 1831, II. 20 n.; system of, under charter of 1848, 290; method of special, 510–513; effects of high rates of, in 1872 and 1873, 617.

Taxpayers and street improvement, II. 293–294.

Tayloe, Benjamin Ogle, "In Memoriam," quoted, I. 293 n., 304;

residence of, on Lafayette Square, **II.** 191; president of Washington and Rockville Co., 344 n.
Tayloe, John, race horses bred by, **I.** 304, 609; Octagon House built by, 316, 346; chosen school trustee, 479; houses erected by, **II.** 14 n.
Tayloe estate, Mansion House enlarged by, **II.** 61.
Taylor, Frank, buys book business of Coale and Co., **II.** 228.
Taylor, George, **I.** 337.
Taylor, John M., **II.** 214 n.
Taylor, Robert I., **I.** 424 n.
Taylor, W. B., member of Scientific Club, **II.** 328 n.
Taylor, Zachary, rival balls at inauguration of, **II.** 416; Whig victory in election of, 416.
Teachers' Institute, **II.** 377.
Tea-duty difficulties in Maryland and Virginia, **I.** 72–74.
Telegraph. See *United States Telegraph.*
Telegraph service, beginning of, **II.** 366–367; development of, 367–368; military censorship of, 474.
Temperance Hall Association, **II.** 397 n.
Temperance Hall enterprise, **II.** 396, 397.
Temperance hotel, opening of, **II.** 396.
Temperance movement, **II.** 222–224, 395–401; active advocates of, 581.
Temperance newspaper, **II.** 283 n.
Temperance Society of Washington, **II.** 222.
Temperance Union of the District, **II.** 223.
Templeman, John, Georgetown merchant, **I.** 97; work in connection with Georgetown bridge, 291; an incorporator of Anacostia Bridge Co., 336; house built in Washington by, 345.
Ten Broeck, Rev. Anthony, principal of St. John's Institute, **II.** 377 n.
Ten Buildings, the, **I.** 311.
Tenney, Franklin, **II.** 365 n.
Tenney, William H., on board of police commissioners, **II.** 487 n.
Tennison, Joshua, hotel keeper, **II.** 14 n.; proprietor of Washington Hotel, 59.
Territorial form of government, proposed for District, **I.** 442, 443, 445, 447; established, **II.** 576–579; funds misused by, 622.
Thanksgiving Day, city council refuses to recognize, **II.** 393.
Theatres, opening of, in and about District, **I.** 334–335; in Washington, 361, 520; earliest record of president attending, **II.** 51; growth in importance of, 197; in war time, 494–495.
Theological seminaries, proposed, **II.** 201.
Thespian Benevolent Society, Washington, **I.** 542–543.
Thomas, Isaiah, cited on Washington and Georgetown papers, **I.** 589.
Thomas, Dr. John M., on city hospital staff, **II.** 339.
Thompson, George, early landholder, **I.** 49.
Thompson, Jacob, on street improvement, **II.** 320; recommends change of control of police, **II.** 458.
Thompson, John E., public school teacher, **II.** 378.
Thompson, J. H., first paid assistant engineer of fire department, **II.** 484 n.
Thompson, Jonah, **I.** 337.
Thompson, Pishey, publisher of *American Quarterly Review*, **II.** 179 n.; book-store of, 228.
Thompson, Smith, Ewell residence occupied by, **II.** 7 n.
Thompson, William, sells *Washington Mirror*, **II.** 229; newspaper editor, 409 n.
Thomson, Alexander, prison investigations of, **II.** 92–93; portrait of, hung in city hall, **II.** 93.
Thomson, Charles, secretary of congress, **I.** 26, 104.
Thornton, Sir Edward, residence occupied by, **II.** 620 n.
Thornton, Dr. William, author of accepted plan of capitol building, **I.** 197; sketch of remarkable early career, 197–201; principal achievements of, 201; establishes residence in Georgetown, 201–202; appointed member of board of commissioners, 237; interest of, in a national university, 253; removes residence to Washington, 288; attends to business of building two houses in city for General Washington, 311–312; discussion of charge that plans for capitol building were not work of, 315–318; objections of, to commissioners' decision to divide triangular spaces with property holders, 327–328; statement by, relative to Blodgett's lotteries, 334; site of

home in Washington, 345; Tayloe's Octagon House designed by, 346; farm and racing stud of, 346; president of short-lived fire insurance company, 433; Latrobe's attack on plan of capitol by, 451–452; becomes surety for Samuel Blodgett, 553; Tudor Place designed for Thomas Peter by, 572; saves post-office department and patent office from destruction by British, 628; member of Columbian Institute, II. 29 n., 31; capitol planned by, 36; member of art commission, 43 n.; city commissioner, 310.

Thornton, Mrs., diary of, cited and quoted, I. 331, 339, 342, 343, 345, 346, 349, 350, 358, 361, 362, 371, 376, 377, 378, 381, 382, 624, 629, 630, 631; attacked by slave, II. 144.

Thornton, William F., in command of militia, II. 145 n.; one of proprietors of *Alexandria Gazette*, 173 n.

Threlkeld, John, mayor of Georgetown, I. 275 n.

Thurman, Allan G., on city government problem, II. 575; failure of District government bill due to, 638.

Thurston, Buckner, appointed associate judge of circuit court of District, I. 455–456, II. 82 n.; director of Washington Library Co., I. 521 n.; on intemperance, II. 221; charges brought against, 436–437; eulogy over, 437.

Thurston, Thomas L., *Journal* bought by, II. 225.

Tiber Creek, I. 53, 54; bridges across the, 493; a source of agues and bilious fevers, 515; course of main stream and branches, 560; Latrobe proposes change of course of, II. 19.

Timberlake, Mrs. Margaret, marriage of, to General Eaton, II. 60–61.

Times and Alexandria Advertiser, I. 303 n., 369.

Times and Potowmack Packet, I. 94.

Tingey, Captain Thomas, I. 331, 381 n.; elected school trustee, 479; commandant of Washington navy-yard, 526; sets buildings in navy-yard on fire, at time of British invasion, 626.

Tobacco, importance of, in all transactions during colonial period in Potomac region, I. 56–57; decline of trade, II. 343–344.

Tobacco inspection houses, I. 56; opening of a house on the Eastern Branch, 524–525.

Todd, W. B., II. 365 n.; on committee for city government plan, 572 n.

Toll bridges, burden of, removed, II. 342–343.

Tomlinson, B. H., hotel keeper, I. 519 n.

Torrey, Jesse, Jr., services of, in slave case, II. 134–135.

Totten, Enoch, corporation counsel, II. 600 n.

Towers, John T., publisher of *Whig Standard*, II. 282; Know Nothing candidate for mayor, 319, 404, 427.

Towles, Nathaniel C., vice-president of New England Society, II. 382 n.; first Recorder of Deeds, 521 n.

Towns of Potomac region, growth and development of, I. 55–61.

Towson, Colonel Nathan, member of Columbian Horticultural Society, II. 193; appointed marshal of the day for Jackson inaugural ceremonies, 213; on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.

Tracy, Senator Uriah, burial place of, I. 609.

Trade, early efforts to promote, in Washington, I. 491–539.

Trade convention at Annapolis, I. 30.

Trades-union, formation of, II. 531.

Travel in 1826, improvement in time and rates of, II. 104.

Travers, John, hotel of, I. 261.

Treasury building, site for and building of, I. 313–314, II. 62 n.; destroyed by fire, 242; erection of new, proposed, 244; Mill's plans for, accepted, 245; defects of, in relation to city's plan, 246.

Treasury department, opening of, in Washington, I. 351; Federalists charged with attempt to burn records of, 384–385; quartered in private houses, II. 243.

Trees, early move made for preservation of, in Washington, I. 225; clearing ground of, 295; first appropriation by city council for providing, II. 13; Pennsylvania Avenue planted with, 237; purchased by congress, 328; plan for planting under Shepherd rule, 601.

Trenton, N. J., assembling of congress at (1784), I. 12, 18; locality of, favored by congress as permanent seat of government, 16–17.

Trinity Catholic Church, Georgetown, I. 88.

Trinity Episcopal Church, Washington, II. 188; date of erection, 285 n.; sold to Congregational Society, 390.

Trinity German Evangelical Lutheran Church, Washington, date of erection, II. 285 n.

Tripoli Monument, I. 568–569, II. 239, 328.

True Whig, II. 281.

Trumbull, John, visit of, to site of federal city, I. 149 n.; paintings by, in rotunda of capitol, II. 42.

Trustees chosen for Washington school board, I. 479.

Truth, The, 426 n.

Tucker, Beverly, publisher of *Washington Sentinel*, II. 424 n.

Tudor Place, residence of Thomas Peter, I. 572.

Tunnicliff, William, hotel keeper, I. 292, 310, 519.

Tunnicliff's tavern (Washington City Hotel), I. 310, 519, II. 14 n.; dancing assemblies at, I. 381; tearing down of, 636.

Turnbull, Captain, William, in charge of building Alexandria aqueduct, II. 111–112; mentioned as topographical engineer, 310.

Turner, Judge George, plan submitted by, for capitol building, I. 195 n., 196.

Turner, Thomas, on Georgetown retrocession committee, II. 260 n.

Turner, William, mayor of Georgetown, I. 275 n.

Turnpikes, building of, I. 515–516, 532–535; provided by private enterprise, II. 98, 100–102, 117, 342–345.

Turreau, General, French minister, I. 575.

Turton, John B., on committee for street improvement, II. 501.

Tuston, Rev. Septimus, pastor of Central Presbyterian Church, II. 382.

Tuyll, Baron de, Decatur residence occupied by, II. 7 n.

Twenty Buildings, the, I. 280–282, 321 n.

Twining, Thomas, English traveller, quoted, I. 270, 272–273.

Tyler, John, succeeds General Harrison as president, II. 271; unpopularity of, 271–272; vetoes bank measure, 271–272; Whig demonstration against, 272–273; night police protection due to, 273; interest of, in city hospital, 339; mode of life of, during administration, 447–448.

Typographical societies, organized in Washington, I. 598; difficulties of Duff Green with, II. 229–230; beneficial organizations rather than trade bodies, 230; temperance dinner of Columbia Typographical Society, 396.

U

Underwood, John, owner of C Street Spring and of hotel building, I. 563 n.; charter member of Botanical Society, II. 27 n., 31.

Uniforms of District militia, I. 566.

Unimproved property, discrimination in favor of, in Washington system of taxation, I. 469–470.

Union. See *Washington Union*.

Union Bank, Georgetown, I. 433, 535, II. 195.

Union Benevolent and Employment Society, II. 218 n.

Union Circulating Library, I. 521, 522.

Union Fire Company of Washington, I, 558, II. 243, 279, 483.

Union Guard, Constitutional Union campaign paper, II. 452 n., 455 n.

Union Land association, II. 370.

Union and Lebanon Lodge of Masons, I. 617 n.

Union Line of omnibuses, II. 362, 363.

Union Masonic Lodge building, rooms in, occupied by city officials, II. 80 n.

Union Methodist Episcopal Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.

Union Tavern, Georgetown, I. 280, 520, II. 60; used as hospital, 479 n.

Union Tavern and Washington Hotel, I. 344.

Unitarian Church, First, designed by Bulfinch, II. 36.

Unitarianism, discourses on, II. 184.

United States, proportion toward improvement of streets paid by, II. 19; assessed valuation of land and buildings of (1837), 26; estimated valuation of land and buildings by Alexander R. Shepherd, 624–625.

United States Bank, building bought by, II. 175.

United States Board of Improvement, organization of, II. 107.

United States Hotel, II. 445 n.

United States Journal, II. 408.

United States Magazine and Democratic Review, II. 234 n.
United States Reporter, II. 411.
United States Telegraph, II. 173, 174, 175, 210, 229.
United States Theatre, opening of, I. 361.
Universal Gazette, Samuel Harrison Smith's weekly, I. 365, 366, 370, 589.
University, National. *See* National university.
University Square, Naval Observatory on, II. 331.
Upper Bridge, II. 98.
Upper Road, opening of, II. 130.
Upton, Charles H., II. 365 n.
Usher, John P., federal interests in street-paving represented by, II. 497; plan of, for street improvement and sewerage, 498.
Ustick, T. W., publisher of weekly magazine, II. 179 n.
Utermehle, Charles H., on committee for street improvement, II. 501.

V

Vagrants, restriction of, in Washington, I. 547, 549–550.
Vail, Alfred, telegraph office in charge of, II. 367.
Valaperti, Italian sculptor, eagle in the house designed by, II. 32.
Van Benthuysen, Wendell and, public printers, II. 410.
Van Buren, Abraham, son and private secretary of president, II. 251.
Van Buren, Martin, Decatur residence occupied by, II. 7 n.; directs sale of President Jackson's cheese for poor relief, 220; *Globe* supports, 229; shorter day in government work adopted by direction of, 231; inauguration and social customs of, 251; Democrats of District express appreciation of, 270; Georgetown Heights summer home of, 310–311; ceremonious mode of living, 447.
Vanderwerken, Gilbert, omnibuses owned by, II. 362.
Van Hook, John W., one of Union Land association promoters, II. 370 n.
Van Ness, John P., I. 536–537; sketch of career and story of marriage with Marcia Burnes, 570–571; residences of, 571, 572; prominence of, in Washington affairs, 572; a commissioner to have charge of rebuilding of public edifices, 636; residence of, II. 6; retirement of, to private life, 35; mayor of Washington, 165; delegate to first Democratic convention, 236; chairman of Jackson central committee, 210 n.; vice-president of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.; ground for church donated by, 382 n.; land for Temperance Hall given by, 396.
Van Ness, Mrs., directress of Washington City Orphan Asylum, I. 543 n.
Vaughn, Sir Charles, Decatur residence occupied by, II. 7 n.
Villard, Andrew J., employé at Washington arsenal, 527.
Virginia, offers made by, looking to securing seat of national capital, I. 7; retrocession of portion of District to, in 1846, 545. *See* Potomac region.
Virginia convention, ordinance of secession adopted by, II. 473.
Virginia Gazette, early newspaper, I. 95.
Virginia Journal and Alexandria Advertiser, I. 93.
Virginia Theological Seminary, II. 201.
Voting qualifications in Georgetown and Alexandria, I. 446.
Vowell, Thomas, treasurer of Bible Society of District of Columbia, 601 n.

W

Wages of laborers at capitol, I. 322 n.
Wagner, Joseph, an owner of *Federal Republican* newspaper, I. 590, 591.
Walker, George, I. 144, 146, 303, 327; newspaper controversy between commissioners and, 297.
Walker, Dr. Mary, II. 580.
Wallace, Robert, marshal of the District, II. 386 n.
Wallach, Richard, II. 365 n.; marshal of the District, 386 n., 421; editor of *Evening Star*, 421; independent candidate for mayor, 430, 456; elected acting mayor, 487; on committee for street improvement, 501; reëlected mayor, 516; opinion of, on District suffrage vote, 554; opposition of, to colored recognition, 560.
Wallach School, II. 506.
Wallis, G. B., II. 415 n.
Ward, John, president of Democratic Association, II. 271 n.

Ward, Ulysses, publisher of *Daily Fountain*, **II.** 397 n.
Warden, D. B., " Chorographical Description of the District," cited, **I.** 500, 504, 526 n., 544, 579, 589, 590; second list of District plants made by, **II.** 28 n.
War department, establishment of, in Washington, **I.** 351; fire destroys records of, 384–385; building of, **II.** 68 n.; quarters of, in private houses, 243 n.
Wards, division of Washington into, **I.** 468–469; changes in, **II.** 286–289.
Ward's Tavern at Greenleaf Point, **I.** 261.
Ward system, retarding influence of, **II.** 286–289.
Warfield, Dr. Peregrine, **II.** 12 n.
Waring, L. H., work by, cited, **I.** 86.
Waring, Marsham, an incorporator of Georgetown Mutual Insurance Co., **I.** 337.
War of 1812, opening of, **I.** 590; bitterness of political feeling over, 590–594; renewal of interest in militia due to, 611; expansion of business during, 617.
War office building, Sunday services held in, **I.** 409.
Warren, Admiral, commander of British fleet in War of 1812, **I.** 612.
War ships, appropriation for, and preparations for building, **I.** 330, 331.
Washington, D. C., description of region where located, **I.** 44 ff.; early patentees of region, 49–55; important part taken by President Washington in establishment of, 105; plan of, intended by President Washington, 106; Washington's choice of site for, 119–120; appointment of commissioners for, 120–121; plans of city, 129–131, 135–136, 144–145, 147–150, 153–154, 173–176, 184–186; sales of lots in order to raise funds, 150–152, 159–163, 204–205, 213, 362, 415–416; real estate speculation in, 216–222, 234 ff., 256–259, 278 ff.; name of, substituted for Georgetown in official letters of commissioners, 226; local government for, aside from commissioners, the levy court of Prince George County, 285; population and appearance in 1796, 285 n.; notable period of building activity in, 310–314; removal of seat of government to, 338–353; impressions of, in 1800, 353–355; population statistics, 355–356; conditions in, at time of removal of government, 357–386; question of government of District and city, 387–401, 439–445, 463 ff.; abolition of board of commissioners and appointment of superintendent of city, 417; corporate government provided for, 445–446; character of first city charter, 446; objections raised to United States representation in local affairs of, 447; attempt to establish public school system in, 474–485; markets in, 486–489; observance of Sunday in, 489–490; unsuccessful efforts to make city a centre for trade and business, 491 ff.; increase of, in population (1800–1810), 499 description of, by British ministers (1809), 575; burning of, by British, 626–628; proposed removal of seat of government from, after burning of public buildings, 633–635; recovery of, from British ravages, 635–637; growth of, **II.** 1–9, 191–197, 283–285, 420, 489–496, 587–591; as desirable place of residence, 5, 11; social life in, 45, 47–55, 250–252, 275–276, 444–450, 581–585; as a national centre, 63–64; civic spirit in, 97–105; bankruptcy of, 122–125; business centre of (1838), 196; development of population centres in, 284–285; federal improvements in, 323; adornment of, 328–341; conditions in, preceding civil war, 460–461; loyalty of citizens, 461–466; protection of, 469–472; isolation of, 473–475; civil and military government in, 476–482; as military centre, 478–479; transformation of, in war time, 489; rapid recovery and growth, 490; confederate army near, 533–534; social changes in, after war, 586; building activity, 587–588. *See also under* City.
Washington, George, quoted concerning mutinous soldiers, **I.** 11; on deficiencies of Princeton as a meeting-place of congress, 13–14; letter by, to L'Enfant, 24–25; president of the Potomac Co., 29, 69; need for development of Potomac recognized by, 63–64, 67, 68; churches with which identified, 82; master of Alexandria Lodge of Masons, 103; receptions and ovation to, at Alexandria and George-

town (1789), 104; first recorded utterance of, in regard to federal seat, 105; style of city planned by, 106; personal inspection of site of federal seat by, 108–115; uneasiness of, over plans of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania to retain federal seat of government, 116, 139–140; message of, announcing choice of site of federal seat, 119–120; commissioners of federal district appointed by, 120–122; arrangements made by, to secure the property, 123 ff.; visit of, to Georgetown to talk with landowners, 131–133; letter to Jefferson from, concerning acquisition of lands, 133–134; boundaries of proposed city given out by, 137; revisits Georgetown to reconcile landowners to larger area of federal city, 145, 147; decides to hold public sale of lots, 150; differing views of L'Enfant and, as to sale of city lots, 152; high estimate of L'Enfant's attainments held by, 157, 167; present at auction sale of city lots, 159; mediation of, in stormy episode of Carroll house, 166–167; attends third sale of city lots and buys four on the Eastern Branch, 213; at laying of corner-stone of capitol building, 213–214; quoted in connection with Greenleaf's land ventures, 218, 246; plan of, to found a national university, 251–252; decision of, to apply to congress for financial assistance for city of Washington, 264–265; reception given to, in Washington at termination of presidency, 293–294; two houses built by, in Washington, 311–312; death of, 338; first observation of birthday of, as a memorial day, 338–339; two houses built by, destroyed by British, 627; portrait of, saved by Mrs. Madison from British, 629; plan for placing body in crypt of rotunda of capitol, II. 44; Greenough statue of, 245, 328–329; Mills' equestrian statue of, 329.

Washington, John A., owner of Mount Vernon, II. 371.

Washington, Lund, steward of Mount Vernon estate, I. 263.

Washington, Lund, Jr., third postmaster of Washington, I. 263; dismissal of, 345; trustee of Central Presbyterian Church, II. 382 n.

Washington, Potomac Steamboat Co.'s vessel, I. 539, II. 103.

Washington, Dr. William, I. 324 n.

Washington, William Augustine, estate purchased of, by Joel Barlow, I. 582.

Washington Advertiser, the, I. 283, 364.

Washington Assembly Rooms, Adams' inaugural ball held in, II. 172.

Washington Association and United States Insurance Co., I. 433.

Washington and Alexandria Turnpike Co., 532 n.

Washington and Baltimore pike, II. 100, 101.

Washington Benevolent Society of Carpenters, II. 230.

Washington Book Store, the, I. 383.

Washington Botanical Society, II. 27.

Washington branch railroad, government takes possession of, II. 474.

Washington Bridge Co., I. 506; II. 99; directors of, I. 506 n.; prosperity of, 507; congress purchases rights of, II. 129.

Washington Building Co., pioneer building association, I. 433–434.

Washington Canal Co., II. 21; charter of, granted to city corporation, II. 24; withdrawn, 24.

Washington Catholic Seminary, II. 208.

Washington Circle, II. 330.

Washington City Bible Society, II. 433.

Washington City Canal, building of, I. 242, 493–495, 499–500; lottery organized to complete, 288–289; course of, 289; celebration on completion of, II. 104; controversy over, 105; connection of, with western canal enterprise, 109, 110, 113; appropriation for, 131; improvement of, 265–266, 509.

Washington City Chronicle and Literary Repository, II. 179 n., 227.

Washington City Gazette, first evening paper, I. 594–595.

Washington City Guards, II. 147.

Washington City Hotel, building of, I. 310.

Washington City Orphan Asylum, II. 218, 219, 221, 587.

Washington City Savings Bank, opening of, II. 258.

Washington City Weekly Gazette, II. 168, 169. See *Washington Gazette*.

Washington Club, II. 608.

Washington College, chartering of, I. 89.

Washington Correspondents' Club, II. 586.

Washington County, D. C., creation of, **I.** 401; city of Washington excepted from regular taxation system of, 546.

Washington County, Md., creation of, **I.** 78; called the garden of Maryland, 108 n.; interest of inhabitants of, in securing federal district, 113.

Washington County court, provision made for salaries of, by federal treasury, **II.** 81.

Washington Expositor and Weekly Register, **I.** 586, 588.

Washington Federalist, **I.** 366–367, 436, 586–587.

Washington Gas Light Co., **II.** 15, 16, 295, 296, 298.

Washington Gazette, beginning of, **I.** 282; vicissitudes of fortune experienced by, 302–303; as a political organ, **II.** 169, 173, 174. See also *Washington City Weekly Gazette.*

Washington and Georgetown Railroad Co., **II.** 364, 492, 493, 616.

Washington Guide, first edition, **II.** 27; catalogue of plants in District in, 27–28; later editions, 28.

Washington Hebrew Congregation, **II.** 402.

Washington Horticultural Society, **II.** 194.

Washington Hotel, **I.** 380, 517, **II.** 14 n., 59, 194.

Washingtonian, labor newspaper, **II.** 231; temperance weekly, 397 n.

Washington Infirmary, **II.** 341.

Washington Library, the, **I.** 521–522.

Washington Light Artillery Co., **I.** 404, 406.

Washington Light Infantry Co., **II.** 147, 453.

Washington Literary Institution, **II.** 207.

Washington Manual Labor School, **II.** 218.

Washington Mirror, **II.** 229.

Washington Monument, **II.** 245.

Washington Monument Society, **II.** 323, 325; seized by Know Nothing party, 427.

Washington National Monument Society, **II.** 244, 245.

Washington Naval Lodge, **II.** 198.

Washington Parish of Episcopal Church, creation of, **I.** 233.

Washington Public Baths, the, **I.** 517 n.

Washington Quarterly Magazine, **II.** 179 n.

Washington Relief Society, **II.** 220.

Washington Repository, the, **I.** 382–384.

Washington Republican, **II.** 169, 170, 173.

Washington and Rockville Co., **II.** 344 n.

Washington Schutzen Verein, annual festivals of, **II.** 591.

Washington Sentinel, **II.** 179 n., 424.

Washington Spy, **I.** 96; quoted on reception given Washington by citizens of Hagerstown, **I.** 112.

Washington Theatre, **II.** 51–52, 172, 196; President and Mrs. Lincoln attend opera at, 494.

Washington Theological Repository, **II.** 179 n.

Washington Total Abstinence Society, **II.** 485, 580.

Washington Union, **II.** 407, 408, 409, 410, 412, 418, 422, 424, 443 n.

Washington Wochenblatt, **II.** 426 n.

Watercourses in District of Columbia, **I.** 560–561.

Water front of federal city, treatment of, **I.** 248–250.

Water-supply, of early Washington, **I.** 559–563; for White House and capitol, **II.** 65–66; for government grounds, 238–239; need for adequate, 305, 306; delays attending provision of, 306; inauguration of, 307; financing project, 307–308.

Watterston, George, reminiscences of Washington printed in *Intelligencer*, quoted and cited, **I.** 286 n., 365, 551, 561; editor of *Washington City Gazette*, 594; biographical notice of, 594 n.; first librarian of congress, 636; on board of commissioners for sale of public land, **II.** 23 n.; secretary of Botanical Society, 27 n., 31; editor of *National Register*, 169; member of Columbian Horticultural Society, 193; novels by, 221; removal of, as librarian of congress, 225; secretary of Washington Monument Society, 245 n.

Watts, John, captain of National Blues, **II.** 452 n.

Waugh Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church, date of erection, **II.** 285 n.

Way, Andrew and George, printing office of, **I.** 517.

Weather forecasts, beginning of, **II.** 327.

Webb, Mrs. J. F., secretary of Female Union Benevolent Society, **II.** 220 n.

Webb, W. B., first superintendent of police, **II.** 558 n.

Webster, Daniel, *Intelligencer* supports, **II.** 229; in Tyler cabinet,

281; negotiations of, with England, 449; residence of, 449–450.
Weekly Messenger, II. 179 n.
Weekly Visitor, II. 234 n.
Weems, Dr. John, I. 324 n.
Weightman, Dr. Richard, II. 12 n.
Weightman, Robert C., on board of managers of Washington Monument Society, II. 245 n
Weightman, Roger C., bookseller, I. 595; president of board of commissioners for sale of public lots, II. 22 n.; charter member of Columbian Institute, 29 n.; Lafayette officially received by, as mayor, 45; member of city hall erection commission, 79 n.; candidate for mayor, 161, 162, 427 n.; President Buchanan commissions as major-general, 453; District militia and, 467.
Weightman building, rooms in, occupied by city officials, II. 80 n.
Weill, Edward D., in government service, II. 541.
Welch, Charles D., mayor of Georgetown, II. 558.
Wells, Henry H., district attorney, II. 518 n.
Wells in early Washington, I. 562.
Wendell, Cornelius, public printer, II. 425.
Wendell and Van Benthuysen, public printers, II. 410.
Wescott, F. and J. D., newspaper publishers, I. 369.
Wesley Church, II. 188.
Wesley Methodist Episcopal Chapel, site for church purchased by, II. 394.
Western Canal enterprise, II. 107–115, 265, 266.
Western Hospital, II. 240 n.
Western Lancaster School, II. 208.
Western Market, the, I. 486–487.
Western Presbyterian Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.
Western School, city of Washington, opening of, I. 481, II. 204; location of, and cost of building, I. 482.
Western World, Kentucky newspaper, I. 585.
Westminster Presbyterian Church, date of erection, II. 285 n.
West Point Academy, effort to remove, to Washington, II. 21 n.
Wharf, first corporation, in Washington, I. 520; first steamboat, built, II. 104.
Wharf regulations in Washington, troubles with Law and Greenleaf over, I. 248–250.

"What is Gentility?" novel by Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith, II. 221.
Wheat, Joseph, tavern-keeper, I. 292.
Whelan, Israel, purveyor of public supplies, I. 351.
Whig party, in power, II. 253, 254, 255; enthusiastic campaign of, 269–271; Tyler unpopular with, 271–272; divided on mayoralty candidate, 292; influence of victory of, on newspapers, 416–422.
Whig Standard, II. 282, 427.
Whipping post, use of, in Washington County, I. 425; as punishment for crime, II. 83–84.
Whistler, James McNeill, clerk in coast survey, II. 541.
White, Alexander, I. 43; appointed member of board of commissioners of District, 255; lobbying by, in interests of congressional aid to city of Washington, 265–266; second visit of, to Philadelphia in interests of loan bill, 307–308.
White, George H. B., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.
White, Hugh L., candidate for presidency, II. 228; *Sun* supports, 229.
White, Richard, principal of Western School, I. 481, 485 n.
White, Richard H., charged with treasury building fire, II. 242.
White House, use of name, for president's house, I. 313 n.; rebuilding of, II. 45; early social customs in, 45–55, 179–181, 251–252, 447–448; popular objections to imported furnishings of, 47; unfinished state of, 64–65; water-supply for, 65–66; use of stable of, for public school, 204; exterior finished, 238; running water introduced into, 238; vista of, destroyed by government buildings, 246; locality of, unhealthy, 311.
Whiteoak Slashes, the, I. 561.
Whitman, Walt, in government service, II. 541–542.
Whitman, William H., congressional letter-writer, II. 235 n.
Whittier, John G., corresponding editor of *National Era*, II., 381.
Whitwell, J. C., director of Y. M. C. A., II. 434 n.
Widow's Mite, tract of land known as the, I. 50, 53–54.
Wight, Otis C., principal of Rittenhouse Academy, II. 377; director of Y. M. C. A., 434 n.
Wiley, Rev. David, in charge of

Columbian Academy, **I.** 382 n.; an incorporator of Georgetown Lancaster School Society, 484 n.; editor of *Agricultural Museum* and mayor of Georgetown, 596.
Wiley, John, oration by, in commemoration of Captain Lawrence and Lieutenant Ludlow, **I.** 617.
Wilkes' botanic collection, **II.** 326.
Wilkinson, General James, **I.** 423, 584.
Willard's Hotel, **II.** 445 n.; reception at, for President Hayes, 641.
William and Mary College, establishment of, **I.** 89.
Williams, Benjamin, appointed warden by President Jackson, **II.** 87 n.
Williams, Robert, duel fought by, **II.** 55 n.
Williamsburg, Va., foundation of, **I.** 57.
Williamson, Basil, proprietor of Mansion House, **II.** 59 n.
Williamson, William S., proprietor of City Hotel, **II.** 59 n.
Wills, office of register of, **II.** 519 n.
Wilmer, Rev. William H., secretary of Bible Society of District of Columbia, **I.** 601 n.
Wilmer, Rev. William H., first rector of St. John's Church, **II.** 181; Theological Seminary professor, 202 n.
Wilson, James, *National Palladium* published by, **II.** 179 n.
Wilson, J. Ormond, superintendent of schools, **II.** 507 n.
Wilson, T., first newspaper publisher in Washington, **I.** 263.
Winder, General, **I.** 624, 625, 633; retreats before British force, 626.
Winder building, **II.** 316 n.
Winn, Timothy, connection of, with Navy Yard Bridge Co., **II.** 99. n.
Wirt, William, cited, **I.** 58; description of Bladensburg school by, 90; quoted, 91 n.; on John Templeman, 291; attorney-general, **II.** 171; residence of, 192.
Wise, H. A., duel fought by, **II.** 55 n.; opinion of, on retrocession, 159.
Wolcott, Oliver, cited and quoted, **I.** 341, 341–342, 353, 375, 385; secretary of treasury, 351; impression made by Washington upon, 354.
Wolf, Simon, Recorder of Deeds, **II.** 521 n.
Women, entrance of, into government service, **II.** 541.
Women's rights advocated, **II.** 580.
Wood, John, venal newspaper editor, **I.** 585, 588.
Wood, William, proprietor of Steamboat Hotel, **II.** 104.
Woodbury, Levi, Ewell residence occupied by, **II.** 7 n.
Woodbury's Academy, **II.** 378.
Woodley, estate of Philip Barton Key, **I.** 413.
Woodside, John, veteran government clerk, **II.** 76 n.
Woodward, Augustus B., influence of, on plan of city of Detroit, **I.** 210 n.; "Considerations on the Government of the Territory of Columbia," quoted, 381; cited, 387 ff., 438, 463; publication of essays in the *National Intelligencer*, 388–389; mentioned, 414 n.; arraignment of congress by, for not providing a general government for the city, 463–464; statement by, as a city councilman, 468; interior department advocated by, **II.** 69.
Woodward, Clement, **I.** 146.
Woodward, William, hotel-keeper, **I.** 516.
Woodward Tavern, **I.** 516.
Workhouse, establishment of, in Washington, **I.** 549–550.
Workingmen's Assembly, **II.** 588.
Workmen on capitol, combination of, formed, **II.** 37.
Worthington, Dr. Charles, **I.** 324 n.; **II.** 12 n.
Worthington, Dr. Nicholas, **II.** 12 n.; connection of, with Columbian Medical School, **II.** 201 n.
Wright, John, schoolmaster, religious services conducted by, **II.** 183.
Wylie, Andrew, associate justice of Supreme Court, **II.** 518.
Wylie, David, of Georgetown Academy, **II.** 209.

Y

Yagers, volunteer militia company, **II.** 452 n.
Yellow fever epidemic, of 1797, **I.** 305; in 1832 and 1849, **II.** 309.
Yoast, John, **I.** 77.
Young, Abraham, original proprietor, **I.** 135.
Young, Charles B., Emerson Institute founded by, **II.** 378.
Young, George, **I.** 424 n.
Young, Notley, early landholder, **I.** 51, 75, 135 n.; a protestant against unexpected area of federal city, 138, 144; lots purchased of, by Greenleaf, 219; death of, 467 n.;

estate left by, 556; knit goods manufactory in house of, II. 4.
Young, Robert, director of Washington Bridge Co., I. 506 n.
Young family, original proprietors of land in District, I. 51, 55.
Young ladies' seminary, II. 208.
Young Men's Christian Association, II. 192; organization of, 434; first convention of, 434; first officers, 434 n.; building erected, 589.
Young's Spring, Washington, I. 560.

Printed in the United States of America.